

THE PNEUMATOLOGIST.

J. LITCH, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

VOL. I.

PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1850.

No. I.

INTRODUCTION.

TULLIUS remarks, "If I am wrong in believing that the souls of men are immortal, I please myself in my mistake: nor while I live will I ever choose that this opinion, wherewith I am so much delighted, should be wrested from me: but if at death I am to be annihilated, as some minute philosophers imagine, I am not afraid lest those wise men, when extinct too, should laugh at me for my error."—*Addison's Evid.*, p. 184.

It will be the aim of this publication, to establish, by all legitimate means, the doctrine of man's spiritual existence after death till the resurrection, when soul, spirit, and body will be re-united, to receive their final retribution. Our appeal will first be to the Scriptures of truth, to establish these doctrines; but in addition to their direct testimony, we shall avail ourselves of all the collateral evidence within our reach. We frankly avow our entire confidence in the faith and confession of the Pharisees, in the fact of the resurrection, and existence of angels and spirits.—Acts xxiii. 8.

We have as good reason to believe in the existence and visible manifestation of departed spirits, as we have in the existence of a murder. We have never, as that good man, John Wesley, remarks, seen either the one or the other; but we have the testimony of unimpeachable witnesses as to both. For the last few years we have openly avowed this faith on all proper occasions, and by so doing have learned

what we could not before have credited, that there are very few families to be found, who have not some well-authenticated facts of the appearance of departed spirits to some member of it. And the reason why so few avow it is, the fear of being charged with being superstitious. Nor do these things happen alone to professed Christians, nor yet to the ignorant and credulous, but to the most skeptical, and the most learned men of this and other ages. Shall we be told that a great many have been imposed upon, and have, at length, found the appearance was only a trick? We are perfectly aware of that fact, and could, probably, fill a volume with such instances. But what does that prove? Certainly not that there is no genuine coin, because there are counterfeits. In the instances we shall introduce, we shall be exceedingly cautious, to present facts from the highest and best authority, both from the past and the present ages.

One well authenticated fact, of the visible manifestation of a departed spirit, is sufficient to silence Atheism, Deism, and Materialism. For, if it is true, they are false. For if one spirit disembodied exists, more may exist. But we trust to be able to present many such facts, in corroboration of the scriptural testimony of their existence. In the language of Wesley, we "owe infidelity no such debt as to give up any part of the proof of a future existence." "We enter our most solemn protest against such a course on the part of Christians."

We design, also, to narrate, review, and expose, the spiritual manifestations at Rochester, N. Y., as well as expose the utter weakness and puerility of the attempts which have been made to explode these facts. Psychology, mesmerism, clairvoyance, new revelations, miracles, &c., &c., will all, in due time, receive a share of attention; as, also, necromancy, and dealing with familiar spirits.

We believe the church to be in danger from two sources :

—1. Of falling into a spirit of skepticism as to the existence of spiritual agents, and a spiritual world ;—and, 2. Of being removed from the steadfastness of their faith in the Scriptures, by spiritual operations. Against both these dangers we shall endeavour to guard our readers, and set before them the happy medium. We hope to be able to present to the public, a work which will be read both with interest and profit.

The progress of materialism is a subject which should awaken lively and energetic efforts on the part of all evangelical Christians, to counteract its influence. If it is true that there is an intelligent spirit in man, which survives in consciousness the death of the body, it is important that all should understand it, and act in reference to it. No one can wish to die in a state of deception, and awake in another state to find their mistake. Finally, the whole question of man's final destiny is involved in this. If it can be proved from Scripture and facts that the spirit of man does exist in consciousness after death, then the terms *die, perish, destroy, consume, &c.*, being all used in reference to temporal death, when the spirit does survive, do not prove the final extinction of the conscious being of the wicked.

SINGULAR CASE OF PREVISION, BY THE MONK OF ORVAL.

WE give the following as an illustration of the power of prevision, and proof of a spiritual nature in man, which we shall more fully illustrate in future numbers. To the present time it has been strikingly accomplished. The times and moons we do not understand.—ED.

THE PROPHECY OF ORVAL:

Pointing out all the remarkable events from the first French Revolution down to the present time.

The author was Philip Olivarius, a monk to whom is attributed the *Previsions* of a Solitary, printed in 1544 ; it bears the name

of the *Prophecy of Orval*, being handed down to the present time by copies taken from the one in possession of the monks of Orval.

“At that time a young man comes from beyond the sea into the country of Celtic Gaul, shows himself strong in counsel. But the mighty, to whom he gives umbrage, will send him to combat in the land of captivity. Victory will bring him back to the former land. The sons of Brutus will be confounded at his approach, for he will overrule them and take the name of Emperor. Many high and powerful kings will be sorely afraid, for the eagle will carry off many sceptres and crowns. Foot and horsemen, carrying blood-stained eagles, numerous as gnats in the air, will run with him throughout Europe, which will be confounded and full of carnage. For he will be so powerful that God will be thought to combat with him.

“The church of God, in great desolation, will be somewhat consoled in seeing her temples opened again to her many lost sheep, and God is praised. But all is over, the moons are passed. The old man of Sion cries to God from his grief-stricken heart, and behold! the powerful one is blinded for sins and crimes. He quits the great city with so brilliant an army that none was ever seen to compare with it; but no warrior will be able to stand before the face of the heavens; and behold! the third part, and again the third part of his army has perished by the cold of the Almighty. The mighty that have been humbled take courage again, and league together to overthrow the redoubted man. Behold! the ancient blood of centuries accompanies them, and resumes its place and abode in the great city, whilst the man so greatly humbled returns to the country beyond the sea whence he came. Gaul is covered with machines of war; all is over with the man of the sea. Behold! again returned the ancient blood of the Cap.* God ordains peace, and that his holy name may be blessed. Therefore shall great and flourishing peace reign throughout Celtic Gaul. The white flower† is greatly in honour, and the temples of the Lord resound with many holy canticles.

“At this time a great conspiracy against the white flower stalks about in the dark, through the designs of an accursed band, and the poor old blood of the Caps quits the great city, and the sons of Brutus mightily increase. Wo to Celtic Gaul!

* CAP. The elder branch of the Bourbons.

† WHITE FLOWER. The lily, the ensignia of the Bourbon dynasty.

The cock * will efface the white flower, and a powerful one will call himself *the king of the people*. A great commotion will agitate men, for the crown will be placed by the hands of workmen who have combated in the great city. Behold! the thoughts of the men of Celtic Gaul are in collision, and confusion is in all minds. The king of the people will be seen very weak, many of the wicked will be against him; but he was not well seated, and God hurls him down.

"Gaul, as it were dismembered, is about again to re-unite; God loves peace. Come, young prince, quit the isle of captivity; listen, join the lion to the white flower; come. The ancient blood of centuries will again terminate long contestations, then a sole pastor will be seen in Celtic Gaul. The man made powerful by God will be firmly seated, peace will be established by many wise laws. So prudent and wise will be the blood of the Cap, that God will be thought to be with him. Many lost sheep come and drink at the living source. The kings and princes throw down the mantle of heresy, and open their eyes to the faith of the Lord. At that time two-thirds of a great people of the sea will return to the true faith.

"God is yet blessed during fourteen times six moons, and six times thirteen moons. The measure of God's mercies is exhausted, and yet, for the sake of his elect, he will prolong peace during ten times twelve moons. God alone is great. The good is accomplished, the saints are about to suffer. The man of sin is born of two races. The white flower becomes obscured during ten times six moons, and six times twenty moons, then disappears, never to re-appear more. Much evil and little good in those days; many cities perish by fire. Israel then returns for good to Christ the Lord. The accursed sects and the faithful are separated into two distinct parts. The third part of Gaul, and again the third part and a half, will be without faith. It will be the same among other nations. And behold thirty-eight moons, and there is a general falling off, and the end of time is begun. After a number not completed of moons, God combats in the persons of his two just Ones, and the man of sin has the advantage. But all is over! The mighty God has placed before my understanding a wall of fire: I can see no longer. May he be blessed for evermore! Amen."—*Raphael's Prophetic Messenger for 1850.*

* THE COCK. The ensignia of Louis Philippe, the younger branch of the Bourbons.

THE NATURE OF SPIRITS IN GENERAL.

THE design of this article is, to establish the fact that man has a *spirit*, which survives in consciousness when the body is dead; and that death, therefore, is not a destruction or cessation of conscious being. And hence, the terms *die*, *destroy*, *consume*, *perish*, &c. being all used in reference to the temporal death of men, do not mean, when so used, a cessation of conscious existence. We must look, therefore, for some other scriptural definition of the terms. In establishing these points, the first thing to be settled is, THE NATURE OF SPIRITS, AS REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

The Greek word *pneuma* is thus defined by Donnegan: "A breath; a breathing, or respiration—a blast; a wind; air—the breath of life; the vital spirit; life; a living being, (*by later writers*) a spirit; the soul—in *grammar*—a mark of aspiration. From *pneo*, to blow, to breathe, to live," &c.

The question before us is not, Do the Scriptures use the word *pneuma* in the sense of *wind*, *a breath*, *a breathing*, or *respiration*? for it is fully admitted that they do sometimes so use it.

But, do they also use it in the sense of *vital spirit*, *life*, *a living being*? Do they attribute to it consciousness, intelligence, volition?

We shall now proceed to prove that the word is frequently used in this latter sense, and has these attributes.

SPIRITUALITY OF GOD'S NATURE.

In John iv. 24, it is used in the highest possible sense. "GOD IS A SPIRIT." *Pneuma ò Theos*.

This point, therefore, needs no comment. *Pneuma*, or *Spirit*, is a term expressive of a living, intelligent, and active being. All the attributes of the godhead do attach to pure spirit. Every argument, therefore, to establish the doctrine of the inertness and unconsciousness of man's spirit, separate from the body, growing out of the nature of a pure spiritual existence, falls to the ground. Texts expressive of the spiritual essence, or substance of the Divine being, might be multiplied, but this one is sufficient to establish and illustrate the point.

SPIRITUALITY OF ANGELIC NATURES.

Having shown the word *pneuma*, to be a term expressive of the Divine substance, and possessed, therefore, of every possible perfection, we descend in the scale of being, and inquire the nature of angels. True, the word angel (*aggelos*) is used as expressive of a variety of agents, good and bad, and is appropriated

to signify a messenger of any description. And among other significations, it is used as a designation of spiritual agents, who wait on God in the heavenly courts, and serve him and his saints. Heb. i. 7, 13, 14: "And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits (*pneumata*), and his ministers a flame of fire." Again, "To which of the angels said he at any time, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits (*pneumata*), sent forth to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation?" Concerning these blessed messengers, we have numerous instances on record of their appearance and interference in the affairs of men; thus evincing that they have both intelligence and might. It was one of those celestial beings who met Balaam in the way, when he went to curse Israel, and resisted his progress. He remained invisible to the eyes of Balaam, but visible to his beast for a season; and finally rendered himself visible to the prophet. From this circumstance we learn that a spirit is capable of rendering itself visible or invisible at pleasure. The angel Gabriel, who on several occasions appeared to Daniel, and also to Zacharias the father of John the Baptist, and to the Virgin Mary, conversed audibly with them; and hence it is evident that a spirit has the power of speech. Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21; Luke i. 19, 26. The visit of an angel of the Lord to Peter, when he was bound in prison, and his deliverance from the stocks and the prison-house, as recorded in the twelfth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, is an evidence of the might which a spirit is capable of exerting.

Of these spiritual agents, the apostle Paul informs us, there are in the heavenly Jerusalem an innumerable company. Heb. xii. 22. And they are sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation. And thus it is written in the Psalms, "He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways, and in their hands they shall bear thee up."

Let us now recapitulate. 1. An angel is *pneuma*, a spirit. 2. He has form; and that form human—"the man Gabriel." 3. He has members: "in their *hands* they shall bear thee up;" "I fell at his *feet* to worship; and he said unto me, see thou do it not, for I also am thy fellow-servant, and of the prophets; worship God." Rev. xxii. 4. He can render himself visible or invisible. 5. He has might and intelligence. Therefore a finite or created SPIRIT may have form, members, intelligence, might, and can render himself visible and hold converse with men.

DEMONIACAL SPIRITS.

These also are subjects of revelation; and are described as possessing intelligence and might; as being interested in and connected with the affairs of men; and affecting both their minds and bodies. In the days of Christ, according to the New Testament teaching, these spirits numerous affected men, having the power of speech, and control over both the bodies and minds of their subjects. Indeed, they were possessed of great power, so that individuals under their influence could not be bound with chains.

“And in the synagogue there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil; and he cried out with a loud voice, Saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not.” “And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ.” Luke iv. 33–35, 41. The same word, *pneuma*, used in reference to the substance of God and angels, is used in reference to these devils or *daimonia*.

Having established the fact that the three orders of beings, God, angels, and demons, are called by the common word *pneuma*, spirit, and that they all have a personal existence, intelligence, and might, we shall next consider—

MAN'S SPIRIT.

It is abundantly revealed that man has a spirit, properly a part of his own identity. Luke i. 47: “My (*pneuma*) spirit doth rejoice in God my saviour.” Acts vii. 59: “And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my (*pneuma*) spirit.”

It is not needful to multiply texts in proof that man has a spirit. But the question is, what is it? Is it a *breath*, a *breathing*, a *wind*, *air*, &c. or is it a *living being*, the *vital spirit*, &c.?

We do not deny that it is sometimes used by the sacred penmen to signify *breath*, &c.; but shall prove that when applied to man, it *sometimes* also has the same meaning that it has when applied to God, angels, and demons; it is expressive of a living, intelligent being, or agent, constituting a part of man's identity. And if we can prove that it is *once* used in this sense, we have established our point. For it does not matter how many times

it is used in other senses ; that has nothing to do with the question at issue. An objector would have no more right to say, because it is once used to signify *breath*, *wind*, or *air*, therefore it always has that signification, than we have to assume, because it in some instances is used to express a living, intelligent agent, therefore it always has that meaning.

THE ORIGIN OF MAN'S SPIRIT.

In the account of the creation, related in Gen. ii. 7, we are told that "God made man of the dust of the earth." He was then only a lifeless mass of organized dust. An addition was made to the man ; "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." What did that act of the Almighty produce ? We reply, it effected some addition to the man, by means of which he became, or was constituted, a living soul or person. "The *body* without the *spirit* is dead." *St. James*. The act of God produced a spirit in man ; for his spirit was not an original formation with the body, but a distinct production. That it is not material, in the sense in which the body is, appears from the distinction made by the wise man, Eccl. xii. 7 : "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was : and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." How, or in what sense did he give it ? He has answered for himself, in Zech. xii. 1 : "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens and layeth the foundation of the earth, and FORMETH THE SPIRIT OF MAN WITHIN HIM."

This text is a solemn and formal declaration of God's creating energy ; and among other acts of creative power, he formed the *spirit of man*, not with the body, but *within* it. The body was made of dust ; and the spirit not of dust, formed *within* that body of dust. Hence, he is called "the God of the spirits of all flesh." There is, therefore, "a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." But it will be objected, "True, man has a spirit ; but you have not proved it to be a conscious, intelligent principle, which survives in consciousness after death."

To this we reply, we have not yet attempted that point. All that has been attempted thus far, is, to show that man is invested with something called *pneuma*, or spirit ; being designated by precisely the same term expressive of the substance of God, angels, and demons ; which last three orders of beings have been proved to have form, intelligence, and might. All these, therefore, are attributes of *pneuma*, or spirit, which man possesses.

The question now occurs, *Does the spirit of man, which we have proved God formed within him, and which is within him, possess any of these attributes?*

Reader, mark this:—we do not *now* inquire, Does the spirit of man exist in consciousness after death?—that is an after-consideration. But does man, the *living* man, possess an intelligent *pneuma*, or spirit? Is the spirit the intelligent principle or agent, in the living man?

This question shall be answered in the language of Scripture. 1 Cor. ii. 11: “What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God.”

The reader will observe that the apostle, in this text, ascribes the same kind of recognition by man’s spirit, or *pneuma*, of the things pertaining to the man, that the spirit, or *pneuma*, of God has of the things of God. If God’s spirit, therefore, has intelligence, so also has the spirit of man. Language cannot make this more plain.

Let no one confound the terms, *psuche*, soul or life, with *pneuma*, spirit. We use them in an entirely different sense. To combat us about the soul, therefore, will not meet the point. The term *soul* will receive attention in due time.

But we shall, perhaps, be reminded that the beasts are said to have a spirit, as well as man. True, a spirit is attributed to them. And if it can be as clearly proved from Scripture that the brutes have an intelligent spirit as it is that man has such a spirit, the point will be freely admitted, not before. Till then we neither affirm nor deny its intelligence.

But to proceed with the evidence of the intelligence of man’s spirit. It is through the medium of *man’s spirit* that God communicates with him. Rom. viii. 16: “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit [*pneumati*], that we are the children of God.” Thus God communicates with our spirit, because there is a congeniality of nature, both being spirit.

THE SPIRIT OF MAN IS THE SUBJECT OF EMOTION.

Thus Mary, the blessed virgin, gave utterance to her emotions: “My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my *spirit* doth rejoice in God my saviour.” Luke i. 47. Here the emotion of joy is ascribed to the spirit. Acts xvii. 16: “Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his *spirit* was stirred within him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry.” Acts xviii. 5: “Paul was pressed in *spirit*, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the

Christ." Proof texts might be multiplied to any extent; but the above are sufficient to establish the proposition.

THE SPIRIT OF MAN HAS FORM.

Thus the disciples of Christ believed, and he did not correct, but rather confirmed them in that faith. Luke xxiv. 37, 39: "And supposed they had seen a spirit," or *pneuma*. He said to them, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a *spirit* (*pneuma*) has not flesh and bones as ye see me have." The difference between a body and a spirit is, that a body has flesh and bones, a spirit has not.

Will it be said, that their fear originated in the relicts of superstition which still adhered to them? We reply, if so, the Saviour should have removed the superstitious notion, by informing them that there was no such thing in existence as a human spirit disembodied. Then was an occasion which called for such an exposure of popular superstition, if such it was. But he did no such thing. We therefore conclude the fact of such appearances on some occasions is correct. We shall amply illustrate this point under its appropriate head, by an appeal to facts. But at present we have to do only with the testimony of the Scriptures.

The spirit of Samuel appeared in the form he possessed while he lived. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14: "What form is he of? And she said an old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel."

THE SPIRIT OF MAN DOES LEAVE THE BODY AT DEATH.

We do not *now ask*, Does the spirit retain its consciousness after death? that will be attended to in its place; but we shall present the evidence that it, whatever may be its nature or attributes, leaves the body at death.

Ecc. xii. 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." The body and spirit are, therefore, dissimilar in their production and the disposition made of them at death. The one made of the dust of the earth, the other formed within that body, by Divine energy. The former, in death, returns to dust, the latter returns to God.

Luke xxiii. 46: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost." Acts vii. 59: "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Both these passages prove that the persons were possessed of a spirit, which was to leave the body, and for the keeping of which they invoked Divine power.

THE SPIRITS OF MEN DO RETAIN THEIR IDENTITY AND
CONSCIOUSNESS AFTER DEATH.

We now come to the positive testimony of Scripture on this point.

1 Pet. iii. 18-20: "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by which [spirit] he went and preached to the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing," &c.

This text means one of two things. Either that Christ, during the time of his death, went by his spirit and preached to the spirits of the antediluvians which were then in prison; or he went and preached in the days of Noah, by the spirit which raised him from the dead, to those people who lived while the ark was preparing. They then being disobedient to that preaching were lost; and their spirits, in the days of Peter, were in prison. This latter is our own view of the subject. But in either view, the spirits of those sinners were in prison some two thousand five hundred years after the flood: they must, therefore, have retained their identity after death.

But the apostle, in 1 Pet. iv. 5, 6, is still more explicit. He says, referring to sinners, "Who shall give account to him who is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For, for this cause was the gospel preached to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." The doctrine of this text is, that those who are dead, had the gospel preached to them during their day of probation, and are thus, although now dead, the subjects of judgment or trial. That although dead as men, they live according to, or in the same manner as, God *in spirit*. In that spiritual form, they will be judged in the same manner as men in the flesh. We regard this as an incontrovertible evidence of the existence, in consciousness, of the spirits of men after death. Human spirits live in a spiritual form or condition after death, as God does. We have an outward man and an inward man; the one may perish, and at the same time the other be renewed.

We have now proved God, angels, demons, and men, to possess a spiritual form or substance, conscious and active; and that death does not destroy the existence or identity of that spirit of man. In future numbers we shall confirm and illustrate the separate existence of the spirit of man, by a variety of Scriptures, arguments, and facts.

SPIRITUAL MANIFESTATIONS.

THE fact of the visible and other sensible manifestations of departed spirits, is a conclusive evidence of their personal existence after death. We are aware of the strong popular prejudice which exists against the idea, and the facility with which many are silenced by the cry of superstition. But the visible appearance of departed spirits is a fact as well attested as any that can be named in the whole range of human knowledge. Thousands of the wisest and best, as well as the most skeptical, of this and other ages, have been witnesses of the phenomena, under circumstances where collusion or imposition was impossible. The Scriptures recognise the fact, and give us a history of such a transaction in the case of Saul, king of Israel, and Samuel the prophet, who appeared to and conversed with the king, and foretold his coming fate, 1 Sam. xxviii. The reader can consult the passage. There is not a more plain history recorded in the Bible than this. The recognition made of this phenomena, by the disciples, after our Lord's resurrection, shows that such occurrences did take place in that day. Luke xxiv. 37—39.

FAMILIAR SPIRITS

Constitute another evidence of a spiritual existence after death. Dealing with familiar spirits has been practised from the earliest ages, and exists in the world to the present time. It, with other kindred practices, existed to so great and alarming an extent among the Canaanites, that it was for this reason that the Lord drove them out of the land, and caused them to be destroyed: and then passed the most positive and stringent laws against the practice by his people. Deut. xviii. 9—12: "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord: and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee."

Is it reasonable to suppose that God would have enacted such a law if the evil did not and could not exist? But it will, perhaps, be said, it does not appear from that passage, that a familiar spirit was a human spirit. It may have been demons who com-

municated with those present. To this we reply, Who can prove that all the demons referred to in Scripture are not human spirits? But more on this at another time. We have divine testimony on the subject. Isaiah viii. 19: "When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them with familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter; should not a people seek unto the Lord their God? For the living, to the dead?" This is a plain recognition of the fact that familiar spirits were those of the dead. And the object of the Holy Spirit is, to show the absurdity and wickedness of the living going to the dead to seek wisdom. That they should go to God. But, notwithstanding the strict prohibition of the Lord, Israel did run into that sin, to an enormous extent. It is said in a passage before quoted, 1 Sam. xxviii., that Saul had put away all that had familiar spirits out of the land. He had done this by putting them to death.

But in the days of Manasseh, king of Judah, he kept and dealt with a familiar spirit, 2 Chron. xxiii. 6: and for this, with his other sins, he was sent into captivity into Babylon.

The Egyptians, also, in their folly, had recourse to familiar spirits. Isaiah xix. 3. Several other references might be given, bearing on this point. But these are sufficient to prove, 1. That familiar spirits have existed from the earliest ages of which history gives us any account. 2. That these familiars were considered by those who dealt with them to have been the spirits of the dead, and that the Lord recognises the fact. 3. That the practice is abominably wicked, whether done by the heathen or the people of God. We now proceed to give the evidence that the practice is reviving in our own day, in the

SPIRITUAL MANIFESTATIONS IN ROCHESTER, N. Y.

The events which have transpired in Rochester and vicinity are justly matters of interest to the community; and it is not to be wondered at that it should draw forth many speculations and attempted solutions of the phenomena. The facts in this case are too well authenticated to admit of a denial; but by what means these facts are produced, is a question which puzzles many.

We first became acquainted with the subject in October, 1848, when on a journey through Western New York, and had the opportunity of learning from ear and eye-witnesses many facts which they had seen and heard. That they are of a supernatural character, that is, produced by some agents, other than living men and women, we have no doubt. The Scriptures recognise the existence and development of spiritual agents, and give us the history of some of their doings. The apostle Paul,

1 Tim. iv. 1, assures us that "the *Spirit* speaketh expressly, that in the last times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing *spirits* and doctrines [or teachings] of devils." So, also, John, in Rev. xvi. 14, says, "I saw three unclean *spirits*, &c., they are the *spirits* of *demons* working miracles," &c.

If such *spirits* are to come and perform what it is here affirmed they will, why are we not to look for them in this day? We feel ourselves bound, both by the Divine and human testimony, to admit the spirituality of the agents, whose history we are about to give; but at the same time to bear witness to their seductive character, and warn the world of the snare thus laid out for their feet.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KNOCKING.

The first that was heard of the mysterious knocks which have subsequently produced so much interest, was in the village of Hydesville, in the town of Arcadia, Wayne county, N. Y. Some thirty or forty miles, if we rightly remember, from Rochester. Mr. Michael Weekman, sometime in 1847, one evening heard a rapping outside his door. On opening it, he found no one there. He went in, for the purpose of retiring, and just before getting into bed heard the rapping repeated. He went quickly to the door, and, on opening, went out and looked around, but still found no one. It being frequently repeated, he went to the door, took hold of the latch, and as soon as the knocking was repeated, he sprang out, went round the house, but saw no one.

One night, a little girl, about eight years old, was heard to scream, the family ran to her, and as soon as she was able to relate facts, she said she felt something like a hand on the bed and all over her, but was not alarmed till it touched her face. It felt cold. It was some days before she recovered her equanimity.

The next family who resided in the house was that of Mr. J. D. Fox, who entered into communication with the spirit. Both Mr. and Mrs. Fox were members of the M. E. Church, well known, and of unimpeachable character. They had never known any similar occurrence, neither they or their family. They moved into the house where Mr. Weekman had lived, in December, 1847, and in March, 1848, first heard the noise. The knocking was so strong as to jar the floor. It was first heard one night, just after the family, except Mr. Fox, were in bed. It continued till they went to sleep, and they were unable to detect the cause. From that time it was continued each night. The 31st of March, the family retired early, and soon heard the knocking. A little girl,

twelve years old, endeavoured to imitate it, by snapping her fingers, and a response was given by knocking as many times as she snapped. When she stopped the sounds ceased. Another girl said, "Now do as I do," and began to strike one hand with the other; the knocks were repeated as before.

When this manifestation of intelligence was learned, Mrs. Fox requested it to count ten: it did so, by rapping ten times. It also, by request, counted the age of the children correctly. Mrs. Fox began to question it as to its identity. When asked if it was a human being, it was silent. "Are you a spirit?" Two raps were given. "Are you an injured spirit?" Two raps, as before, were given. It was finally ascertained that it purported to be the spirit of a pedlar, who had been murdered in that house for his money, five hundred dollars, at the age of thirty-one; and that he had left a wife and five children, and his wife had been dead about two years. The neighbours were then, by consent of the spirit, called in, and the questions continued.

We are indebted to a work called "*Singular Revelations*," recently published in Auburn, N. Y., for the following sketch:—

As a confirmation of what we have now stated, as being related to us by the family, we give the following extracts from the testimony of Mr. William Duesler, of Arcadia, and an immediate neighbour of Mr. Fox, at the time of the transaction. This statement was published in a pamphlet by E. E. LEWIS, Esq., of Canandaigua, New York, which contains the testimony of many persons in the neighbourhood. Mr. Duesler, says: "I live in this place. I moved from Cayuga county here last October. I live within a few rods of the house in which these noises have been heard. The first I heard any thing about them, was a week ago last Friday evening, (31st day of March.) Mrs. REDFIELD came over to my house to get my wife to go over to Mr. Fox's. Mrs. Redfield appeared to be very much agitated. My wife wanted I should go with them, and I accordingly went. When she told us what she wanted us to go over there for, I laughed at her and ridiculed the idea that there was any thing mysterious in it. I told her it was all nonsense, and that we would find out the cause of the noise, and that it could easily be accounted for. This was about nine o'clock in the evening. There were some twelve or fourteen persons there when I got there. Some were so frightened that they did not want to go into the room. I went into the room and sat down on the bed. Mr. Fox asked questions, and I heard the rapping which they had spoken of, distinctly. I felt the bedstead jar when the sound was produced.

"Mrs. Fox then asked if it would answer my questions if I asked any, and if so, rap. It then rapped three times. I then asked if it was an injured spirit, and it rapped. I asked if it had come to hurt any one who was present, and it did not rap. I then reversed this question, and it rapped. I asked if I or my father had injured it, (as we had formerly lived in the house,) and there was no noise. Upon asking the negative of these questions, the rapping was heard. I then asked if Mr. —, (naming a person who had formerly lived in the house,) had injured it, and if so, manifest it by rapping, and it made three knocks louder than common, and at the same time the bedstead jarred more than it had done before. I then inquired if it was murdered for money, and the knocking was heard. I then requested it to rap, when I mentioned the sum of money for which it was murdered. I then asked if it was one hundred, two, three, or four, and when I came to five hundred the rapping was heard. All in the room said they heard it distinctly. I then asked the question if it was five hundred dollars, and the rapping was heard.

"After this, I went over and got ARTEMAS W. HYDE to come over. He came over. I then asked over nearly the same questions as before, and got the same answers. Mr. Redfield went after DAVID JEWELL and wife, and Mrs. Hyde also came. After they came in, I asked the same questions over again, and got the same answers. * * * * * I then asked it to rap my age—the number of years of my age. It rapped thirty times. This is my age, and I do not think any one about here knew my age but myself and my own family. I then told it to rap my wife's age, and it rapped thirty times, which is her exact age; several of us counted it at the time. I then asked it to rap A. W. Hyde's age, and it rapped thirty-two, which he says is his age; he was there at the time and counted it with the rest of us. Then Mrs. A. W. Hyde's age, and it rapped thirty-one, which she said was her age; she was also there at the time. I then continued to ask it to rap the age of different persons, (naming them,) in the room, and it did so correctly, as they all said.

"I then asked the number of children in the different families in the neighbourhood, and it told them correctly in the usual way, by rapping. Also the number of deaths that had taken place in the families, and it told correctly. I then asked it to rap its own age, and it rapped thirty-one times distinctly. I then asked if it left a family, and it rapped. I asked it to rap the number of children it left, and it rapped five times; then the number of girls, and it rapped three; then the number of boys, and it rapped twice. Before this I had asked if it was a man,

and it answered by rapping it was; if it was a pedler, and it rapped.

"I then asked in regard to the time it was murdered, and in the usual way, by asking the different days of the week, and the different hours of the day; that it was murdered on a Tuesday night, about twelve o'clock. The rapping was heard only when this particular time was mentioned. When it was asked if it was murdered on a Wednesday, or Thursday, or Friday night, &c., there was no rapping. I asked if it carried any trunk, and it rapped that it did. Then how many, and it rapped once. In the same way we ascertained that it had goods in the trunk, and that ——— took them when he murdered him; and that he had a pack of goods besides.

"I asked if its wife was living, and it did not rap; if she was dead, and it rapped. I then asked it to rap the number of years the wife had been dead, and it rapped twice. In the same way I ascertained that its children were now living; that they lived in this State—and after asking if such and such county, (naming over the different counties,) at last when I asked if they lived in Orleans county, the rapping was heard and at no other time. This was tried over several times, and the result was always the same. I then tried to ascertain the first letters of its name, by calling over the different letters of the alphabet. I commenced with A, and asked if that was the initial of its first name; there was no rapping. When I came to C, the rapping was heard, and at no other letter in the alphabet. I then asked in the same way in regard to the initials of its surname, and when I asked if it was R, the rapping commenced. We then tried all the other letters, but could get no answer by the usual rapping. I then asked if we could find out the whole name by reading over all the letters of the alphabet, and there was no rapping. I then reversed the question, and the rapping was heard. * * * * There were a good many more questions asked on that night by myself and others, which I do not now remember. They were all answered readily in the same way. I stayed in the house until about twelve o'clock, and then came home. Mr. Redfield and Mr. Fox stayed in the house that night.

"Saturday night I went over again, about seven o'clock. The house was full of people when I got there. They said it had been rapping some time. I went into the room. It was rapping in answer to questions when I went in. I went to asking questions, and asked over some of the same ones that I did the night before, and it answered me the same as it did then. I also asked different questions, and it answered them. Some of those in the

room wanted me to go out and let some one else ask the questions. I did so, and came home. There were as many as three hundred people in and around the house at this time, I should think. HIRAM SOVERHILL, Esq., and VOLNEY BROWN, asked it questions while I was there, and it rapped in answer to them.

"I went over again on Sunday, between one and two o'clock, P. M. I went into the cellar with several others, and had them all leave the house over our heads; and then I asked, if there had been a man buried in the cellar, to manifest it by rapping, or any other noise or sign. The moment I asked the question, there was a sound like the falling of a stick about a foot long and half an inch through, on the floor in the bedroom over our heads. It did not seem to bound at all; there was but one sound. I then told Stephen Smith to go right up and examine the room, and see if he could discover the cause of the noise. He came back and said he could discover nothing,—that there was no one in the room or in that part of the house. I then asked two more questions, and it rapped in the usual way. We all went up stairs and made a thorough search, but could find nothing.

"I then got a knife and fork and tried to see if I could make the same noise by dropping them, but I could not. This was all I heard on Sunday. There is only one floor, or partition, or thickness, between the bedroom and the cellar; no place where any thing could be secreted to make the noise. When this noise was heard in the bedroom, I could feel a slight tremulous motion or jar.

* * * * "On Monday night, I heard this noise again, and asked the same questions I did before, and got the same answers. This is the last time I have heard any rapping. I can in no way account for this singular noise, which I and others have heard. It is a mystery to me which I am wholly unable to solve. I am willing to testify under oath that I did not make the noises or rapping which I and others heard; that I do not know of any person who did or could have made them; that I have spent considerable time since then, in order to satisfy myself as to the cause of it, but cannot account for it on any other ground than it is supernatural. I lived in the same house about seven years ago, and at that time never heard any noises of the kind in and about the premises. I have understood from Johnson and others, who have lived there before ——— moved there, that there were no such sounds heard there while they occupied the house. I never believed in haunted houses, or heard or saw any thing but what I could account for before; but this I cannot account for.

April 12, 1848.

(Signed) WM. DUESLER."

To the same effect is the testimony of the following persons, whose certificates are published in the work alluded to, viz. John D. Fox, Walter Scotten, Elizabeth Jewel, Lorren Tenney, James Bridger, Chauncey P. Losey, Benjamin F. Clark, Elizabeth Fox, Vernelia Culver, William D. Storer, Marvin P. Loser, David S. Fox, and Mary Redfield.

These are only a few selected from the immediate neighbours of Mr. Fox. The certificates of persons who have examined this matter up to this time would swell to hundreds, if not thousands.

THE SPREAD OF THE RAPPING TO OTHER PLACES.

Some members of Mr. Fox's family removed to Rochester, where they soon heard the knocking, as at Hydesville. It soon spread to other families, both in Rochester and surrounding country. When we were in Rochester, in December, 1848, we were told that some fifty families had the knocking in their houses. These spirits would usually tell who they were, being mostly some deceased friend of the family. Many persons, as might naturally be supposed, prompted by curiosity, went to the scene of manifestation, to witness it for themselves. A friend of ours, of the most reliable character, and withal a great skeptic as to the existence of such a spiritual operation, called with another friend at Mr. Fox's, and with some difficulty obtained admittance. She was an entire stranger to the family, and while in a room by herself she heard the knocking on the floor. She wished the spirit to tell her age by rapping. It was immediately done. Subsequently, her name was correctly spelled, by calling over the letters of the alphabet, and the spirit would knock when the successive letters were called, with various other manifestations of intelligence.

Another circumstance was related of a clergyman who went to a house to witness these strange proceedings, and requested to have some visible manifestation, when, among other things, a Bible was taken from a table in the room and laid in the lap of a lady on the opposite side of the room. We have the name and address of the clergyman.

We called on a gentleman of intelligence and responsibility, who, we were informed, had witnessed strange things, and he related to us a number of facts. He began by saying: "Before I proceed to relate what I have seen, I wish to say that I am a skeptic on the subject. I do not believe these effects to be produced by a spirit. Since last August [this was in Dec. 1848] I have used my best endeavours to find or detect the deception, if it exists, but to this time have not been able to do so. I went

to Hydesville, to the house where the rapping was first heard, and was present when they dug in the cellar for the bones of the murdered man. I heard the rapping in that house, and also in a neighbouring house where I lodged. In the latter place, I saw the chairs moved about the room, with no one near them. But still I do not believe. When you relate the other facts, I wish you also to state this with them. I will now tell you what I have seen.

"I called at Mr. Granger's, (he is one of our most respectable citizens,) and requested to hear the knocking. I was at first introduced into a room alone, and soon after invited into the room where a number of persons were holding correspondence with the invisible agent. I announced myself as an unbeliever in these things. Mr. Granger asked me what would satisfy me? If I should see that table move across the room, would I believe? I replied, Yes, if I saw it I should believe I saw it. He asked the spirit if he would move the table, to satisfy me. A rapping was heard, which was considered an answer in the affirmative. I then said, If any thing is to be done we will have fair-play. I wish all in the room to stand back a distance from the table and fold your arms. They did so, standing some ten feet from the table. I then went to the table, moved it out and examined behind it, under and around it, and being satisfied that all was right with it, took my place with the others. Mr. G. requested the spirit to move the table to me. The table started and steadily progressed till it came against me, when it stopped. We all fell back to the side of the room several feet more, and stood as before. Mr. G. requested the spirit to move the table to me again. It once more started and came up against me. Mr. G. then requested me to push it back. I pushed it with one hand, and it would not stir. I pushed with both hands and braced myself, and it would not move, until it seemed as if some one had let go with both hands, and then it went with ease. Since then I have seen it done in this office, (he was then in his own office,) and in other places."

This narrative, coming from such a source, certainly commands confidence and respect; and it conclusively, to our mind, proves one thing, and that is, that an invisible power moved the table, and that the facts which are related do exist.

While in Canada West, in November, 1848, much interest was excited by the visit of one of the persons connected with these developments, to her friends in that province. The spirit accompanied her, and continued the knockings.

It would converse freely with persons who were sincere in-

quirers after the truth of the phenomena, but when persons disposed to treat it lightly, or to be captious and to cross its track, were present, it would remain silent. For instance, a friend of ours, and of the family where the lady was, went one evening with a design of doing his utmost to cross it by crooked questions. When he went in, several persons were sitting around the room, asking questions. On his entrance, all the rappings ceased, nor could they get any response. They asked, "Is any one in who should not be here?" A rap was heard. "Who is it. Is it C.?" No response. "Is it Edwin?" A rap. "Must Edwin go out of the room?" A rap was given. He went out, and the communications proceeded as before.

It was a very religious spirit. During a prayer-meeting, it would give frequent responses to the sentiments that were advanced. When the Lord's prayer was repeated, it would respond, by a rap, to each word. It would do the same on reading I John iv. 1.

It was perfectly familiar with the household affairs, and was appealed to on all occasions to decide points of difference, and give directions as to what should be done. As an instance of which we were told: two children disagreed as to which should milk the cow. The spirit was appealed to, to decide the point, and his decision was final. On one occasion a person had been out to purchase goods, and, on being questioned, gave the wrong price. They appealed to the spirit, and he corrected it and gave the true price.

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING FACTS.

We have often been asked, "What do you think it is?" We reply, It is a new development of what has existed more or less in all ages, and what God has especially prohibited by his law given to Moses. Deut. xviii. 9—12. These are clearly familiar spirits. Some, at least, who have, and consulted with them, have entered, if we are correctly informed, into a contract with the spirit to stay with them. For instance, a rapping is heard. The question is asked, Whose spirit is it that wishes to communicate with me? The answer is given. Will you stay with me? A rap is an affirmative. From that time the spirit becomes a familiar. And all that do such things, no matter what may be their profession, are an abomination to God, and they incur his displeasure.

It is also a spirit of divination. They do undertake to deal in the occult, that is to foretell the future. That, also, is one of the forbidden acts. It is in vain to say they are good spirits,

and it is therefore no harm, and it will do no harm. It is sufficient that God has prohibited it in the most positive manner. Nor will it be a valid excuse to plead that that law was only given to the Jews, and is not binding on Christians. For the Lord has expressly declared that the nations of Canaan did practice those things and were, therefore, cast out of that land. If it was so wicked in the heathen, that God would not endure it in them, how must he regard it in Christians? But it is said: They are good spirits and do good; they teach men that they should pray and acknowledge Jesus Christ, &c. So did the spirit who possessed the damsel in the days of Paul, and brought her masters much gain by soothsaying; she said, "These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation." Acts xvi. 16—18. Did Paul tolerate the spirit? So far from it, at the risk of life and limb, he cast out the spirit and brought the wrath of the multitude on him. We are not at liberty to do evil that good may come. If the fact of religious zeal is a justification of the practice of familiar intercourse with spirits, Paul certainly was wrong, and the law of God is wrong and should be revoked.

COMMITTEES OF INVESTIGATION.

The importance of these professed spiritual communications must be obvious to every one who will be at the trouble to reflect but for a moment. If they exist at all, they prove the existence of a spiritual world to be as much of a reality as the material and visible world. They prove us to be in close proximity with that world, and that those unseen agents have the power of interfering with the affairs of men under certain circumstances. To decide the question of the reality of the professed spiritual manifestations at Rochester, the spirits directed by spelling out the words, letter by letter, that the subject should be submitted to a committee of investigation; declaring that these manifestations were to spread and be known to all men.

Accordingly, public meetings were called, and committee after committee, composed of the most responsible citizens of the city of Rochester, both gentlemen and ladies, were appointed, and the subject was submitted to the most rigid tests they were able to devise, with a view, if possible, to determine whether the responses were given by living persons or by spiritual agents. The result of the investigation was, a conviction of the committees that it was the work of invisible agents.

The first committee appointed was at a public meeting at

Corinthian Hall, on the evening of Nov. 14th, 1849. It consisted of A. J. Combs, Daniel Marsh, Nathaniel Clark, Esq., A. Judson, and Edwin Jones. The next evening the committee made a report of their doings. The meeting of the committee was held in the hall of the Sons of Temperance. They reported in detail their experiments; and all "agreed that the sounds were heard, but they entirely failed to discover any means by which it could be done." Another committee composed of Dr. H. H. Langworthy, Hon. F. Whittlesey, D. C. McCallum, Wm. Fisher, of Rochester, and Hon. A. P. Hascall of Le Roy. After a rigid investigation, they concluded their report thus:—"There was no kind of probability or possibility of their being made by ventriloquism, as some had supposed; and they could not have been made by machinery." The third committee consisted of Drs. Langworthy and Gates, Wm. Fitzhugh, Esq., W. L. Burtis, and L. Kenyon, who appointed a committee of ladies to assist them. The result was, a confirmation of what had previously been reported. "Thus, by three days of the strictest scrutiny, by means of science, candour, and intelligence, were the persons in whose presence these sounds were heard, acquitted of all fraud."

EXHIBITIONS OF PHYSICAL POWER.

Messrs. Capron and Barron in their "*Singular Revelations*," relate several instances of the exhibition of physical power by some invisible agent or agents, which must, if true, establish the reality of their existence. Of the truth of their statements we can have no doubt, any more than we can of those we have related, received from our personal friends who were witnesses of the facts, and in whose integrity we have the most perfect confidence.

We give the following from the pamphlet:—

"Saturday evening, Oct. 20th.—This evening we had asked for some different demonstrations, and our request was complied with. We heard the sounds on the wall, bureau, table, floor, and other places, as loud as the striking with a hammer. The table was moved about the room, and turned over and turned back. Two men in the company undertook to hold a chair down, while, at their request, a spirit moved it, and, notwithstanding they exerted all their strength, the chair could not be held still by them. As we sat by the table, the cloth was removed to a different part of the room. The combs of several ladies were taken from their heads and put into the heads of others, and afterwards the combs were returned to their owners and placed in

the hair as before. There was a person present this evening who had been suspicious that the guitar was played a few nights before by some of the persons present. The first thing when we came together was, for the alphabet to be called for by the spirits, who spelled 'A. thinks R. and C. played the guitar!' Thus were her thoughts revealed before the company. At another meeting, another person was told the same thing, although she had never expressed to any one her thoughts.

"During one of these evenings, a wish was expressed that we might see the hand that touched us. On looking toward the window, (the moon shining through the curtain,) we saw a hand waved to and fro before it. We could discover no other part of a form. This we have witnessed many times ourselves, and several have discovered distinctly the features of persons whom they knew and who had been dead for years.

"On one occasion, when several persons were present, the guitar was taken from the hands of those who held it, (they taking hold of hands,) and *put in tune* and commenced playing while it passed around the room above their heads. It was also taken from one person and passed to others in the room. In this way for nearly two hours it continued to play and keep time with the singing; and the guitar was taken by this unseen power to different parts of the room while playing.

"One evening, while several ladies were present, some of them requested that the spirits would take their hair down. Accordingly it was done. One of them had her hair taken down and done up in a twist, and one of them had hers braided in four strands. We cannot pretend to give all the cases of these singular demonstrations which have been witnessed by ourselves and others; it would fill a large volume."

THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF THE SPIRITS.

If the exhibitions of power are marvellous, the theology of these spirits will be interesting. The authors of the pamphlet vouch for the following, as having been spelled out by the spirits; some of whom profess to be the spirits of Emanuel Swedenborg, the Seer of Provost, Geo. Fox, Lorenzo Dow, Galen, Wm. E. Channing, Nathaniel P. Rogers, John Wesley, Samuel Wesley, and many others. They give a few questions and answers out of thousands:—

"*Question.* What is your mission to the world?

"*Answer.* To do good. The time will come when we will communicate universally.

"*Q.* Of what benefit will it be to mankind?

"A. We can reveal truths to the world—and men will become more harmonious and better prepared for the higher spheres.

"Q. Some persons imagine that the spirits are evil, and that Satan is transformed into an angel of light to deceive us. What shall we say to them?

"A. Tell them some of their bigotry will have to be dispensed with before they can believe we are good spirits. Ask them why they refuse to investigate. They are not so wise as they suppose themselves to be.

"Q. Can ignorant spirits rap?

"A. Yes. (An ignorant spirit rapped, and the difference was very plain between that and the other.)

"Q. Are these sounds made by rapping?

"A. No. They are made by the will of the spirits causing a concussion of the atmosphere and making the sounds appear in whatever place they please.

"Q. Can they make the sounds to all persons?

"A. No. The time will come when they can.

"Q. Is there some peculiar state of the body that makes it easier to communicate with some persons than others?

"A. Yes.

"On one occasion a spirit, purporting to be Lorenzo Dow, gave the following definition of Hell:—

"'The Universalists say that Hell is the grave. This is not so. The Presbyterians say it is a place of fire and brimstone that burns the soul for ever. This is not so. *The Hell is man's own body*, and when he escapes from that he escapes from bondage.'"

EVIDENCE OF INTELLIGENCE IN THE SPIRITS.

One of the authors of "Singular Revelations" gives the following facts from his private journal, in proof of their intelligence:

"On the 23d of November, 1848, I went to the city of Rochester on business. I had previously made up my mind to investigate this so-called mystery, if I should have an opportunity. In doing so, I had no doubt but that I possessed shrewdness enough to detect the trick, as I strongly suspected it to be, or discover the cause of the noise, if it should be unknown to the inmates of the house.

"A friend of mine, whom I had long known as a skeptic in regard to any *such* wonders, invited me to go with him to hear it. I accepted the invitation with a feeling that was far from serious apprehension of communicating with any thing beyond my power to discover.

“Before I heard the sound, we seated ourselves around a table. As soon as we got quiet, I heard a slight but distinct rapping on the floor, apparently on the under side. Although I concluded that such a sound *might* be made by machinery, I could see no possible motive in the family taking so much pains to deceive people, as they received nothing but annoyance and trouble in return for their pains. I proceeded to ask some questions, and they were answered very freely and correctly. I asked if it would rap my age? It was done correctly. I then took my memorandum-book from my pocket and *wrote* my questions, so that no other person should know the nature of the questions. I would write—“rap four times; rap one; rap six; rap seven;” and to each and every question I got a *correct answer*. I then laid aside my book and proceeded to ask similar test questions *mentally*, and, as before, received correct answers.

“I could not believe that persons present had the power to discern my *thoughts* and make these sounds in answer, for the sounds have a peculiarity not easily imitated. To suppose this to be the case, would make the matter a still greater mystery. I knew they could not give those answers, for there were questions answered which they could not know any thing about.

“At another time I tried the experiment of counting in the following manner: I took several shells from a card-basket on the table, (small lake shells,) closed my hand and placed it under the table entirely out of sight, and requested as many raps as there were shells. It was done correctly. As I knew how many shells there were in my hands, I resolved to test it in another way, to see if there was a possibility of my *mind* having any influence in the matter. I took a handful of shells, without knowing how many I took myself. Still the answers were correct. I then requested a friend, who sat by the table, to put his hand in the basket, take out some shells without knowing the number, and pass them into my hand, which I immediately closed and placed in a position where none could see it. The number was told as correctly as before. We continued this class of experiments for a long time, without the least failure in getting correct answers.’

“There could be no mistaking these tests. They could not be influenced by our minds, for we did not ourselves know what the answers should be. This places a quietus on its being any thing governed by the minds of those asking questions, or those who hear it most freely. The proofs of getting answers, and correct ones, to mental questions, and to thoughts where questions are not asked, is as plain as even the rapping itself.

"We have known several persons to be sitting around a table in conversation, and, when they ceased, the signal for the alphabet would be called for, and a sentence would be spelled like this: '—— (naming one of the company) thinks so and so,' mentioning exactly what their thoughts were. At one time several persons were present; one wrote on a piece of paper to another something about two other members of the company, which, although unimportant, they did not wish the others to know; but, as if to convince us all of their power to tell our thoughts, the signal was given for the alphabet, and the same spelled out that they had written. This has so often been the case of similar occurrences, that it is placed beyond dispute by those who have tried the experiment of getting answers to mental questions."

The authors of the pamphlet discuss the question of the moral character of the spirits, and, from the facts they present, come to the conclusion that they are good spirits, because they always do good. We give a few of their facts in proof:

"On one occasion, a gentleman of Rochester was indebted to a woman who was in great need of the money. The spirits directed her little sister to go to such a place in the street at a certain hour in the day, and she would meet the man, who would pay her three dollars for her sister. The little girl did not know the man who owed the money, but went as directed. At the appointed time, she met a man, who said to her, 'Are you the girl that lives with Mrs. ——?' She replied in the affirmative. 'Here are *three dollars* I wish you would take to her,' said the man, handing her a bill, and passed on."

A Methodist clergyman, in the city of Rochester, relates the following singular incident:

"Not long after it began to be heard by this family in Rochester, it began to be heard in other houses in the same city, and, among others, in the house of a Methodist clergyman, where the same sounds have continued from that time to this, as they have in other places and houses. The clergyman alluded to, related in a public audience in the city of Rochester the following, which will serve to show the intelligence sometimes manifested by this sound, which so many deny being any thing but an imposition: 'A Mr. P——, a friend of mine from Lockport, had come from that place on business and put up with me. He told me that he had left at home a child sick. I requested him to go to Mr. G——'s to hear this *mysterious noise*. He went, and, like many others, could not make up his mind what it was. In the morning, he again went, when the spirit, who was in communication with him, spelled out this sentence—*Your child is*

dead! Mr. P—— immediately found Elder J——, and, although he as yet had not seen or heard enough to convince him of its reliability, he thought it his duty to start for home. A short time after he started, Elder J—— returned to his house, and his wife handed him a telegraphic communication from Lockport, which he opened and read as follows: *Say to Mr. P—— that his child is dead!*

“Thus did the tangible telegraph, operated by human hands, confirm what some speedier telegraph had communicated nearly three hours before. This is an account that can be relied on, and we have the names of the parties for such as shall question its truth. All who have investigated the matter to any great extent, have found testimony equally convincing. Several persons, who have carefully investigated this affair for the last two years, have kept a private journal, in which they have entered many of the most singular occurrences that have come within their personal observation. Extracts from some of these will be given in another chapter.”

The facts recorded we are not at all disposed to dispute or doubt, any more than if they had come under our own observation. We have so much confidence in those who testify to the facts, and knowing several, at least, to be professed materialists, who of course would not give countenance to such statements unless compelled by a regard for truth, we are forced to the belief of their reality. But, on the character of those spirits, we must beg leave to differ widely from the authors of the pamphlet. We think they have given sufficient data to convict them of belonging to a class which renders them not very desirable companions; and, before adopting them as patron saints, or obtaining their canonization, the matter should be rigidly tested.

In giving this narrative of spiritual manifestations, we have two objects to accomplish:—1st, To confirm the doctrine of a spiritual existence of man separate from the body; and 2dly, To warn Christians, and all who have the fear of God before their eyes, of the sinfulness of dealing with spiritual agents.

We have given but a part of the facts which exist in proof that the events transpiring in the state of New York and elsewhere are performed by spiritual beings. We shall have more to say in our next.

But there are some who admit them to be performed by spiritual beings, who yet deny or doubt their being human spirits. They think the phenomena produced either by the devil or demons. Neither the fact of their declaring themselves human spirits, nor yet the visible appearance of some of them in human

form, is to them satisfactory evidence. And believing, as some do, that the human spirit has no conscious existence out of the body, they cannot admit them to be human.

Leaving this point, therefore, for the present, we give another fact of a different character. We select it from an old work, the title-page of which is lost, but which bears ample internal evidence of having been compiled and published by John Wesley.

A TRANCE.

Letter from Mr. Thomas Tilson, Minister of Aylesworth, in Kent, concerning an Apparition seen in Rochester. Written to Mr. Baxter.

REV. SIR,—Being informed that you are writing about spectres and apparitions, I take the freedom, though a stranger, to send you this following relation :

Mary, the wife of John Goffe, of Rochester, being afflicted with a long illness, removed to her father's house at West Mulling, which is about nine miles distant from her own: there she died, June the 4th, 1691.

The day before her departure, she grew impatiently desirous to see her two children, whom she had left at home, to the care of a nurse. She prayed her husband to hire a horse, for she must go home, and die with her children. When they persuaded her to the contrary, telling her she was not fit to be taken out of her bed, nor able to sit on horseback, she intreated them however to try: "If I cannot sit," said she, "I will lie all along upon the horse, for I must go to see my poor babes."

A minister who lives in the town was with her at ten o'clock that night, to whom she expressed good hopes in the mercies of God, and a willingness to die: "But," said she, "it is my misery that I cannot see my children."

Between one and two o'clock in the morning she fell into a trance. One Widow Turner, who watched with her that night, says, that her eyes were open, and fixed, and her jaw fallen. She put her hand upon her mouth and nostrils, but could perceive no breath; she thought her to be in a fit, and doubted whether she were alive or dead.

The next day, this dying woman told her mother, that she had been at home with her children. "That is impossible," said the mother, "for you have been here in bed all the while." "Yes," replied the other, "but I was with them last night, when I was asleep."

The nurse at Rochester, Widow Alexander by name, affirms

and says, she will take her oath of it before a magistrate, and receive the sacrament upon it, that a little before two o'clock that morning, she saw the likeness of the said Mary Goffe come out of the next chamber, (where the elder child lay in a bed by itself, the door being left open,) and stood by her bed-side for about a quarter of an hour; the younger child was there lying by her; her eyes moved, and her mouth went, but she said nothing. The nurse moreover says, that she was perfectly awake; it was then daylight, being one of the longest days in the year. She sat up in her bed, and looked steadfastly upon the apparition; at that time she heard the bridge clock strike two, and awhile after said, "In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, what art thou?" Thereupon the appearance removed, and went away; she slipped on her clothes and followed, but what became of it she cannot tell. Then, and not before, she began to be grievously affrighted, and went out of doors, and walked upon the wharf (the house is just by the river side) for some hours, only going in now and then to look at the children. At five o'clock she went to a neighbour's house, and knocked at the door, but they would not rise; at six she went again, then they arose and let her in. She related to them all that had passed; they would persuade her she was mistaken, or dreamt: but she confidently affirmed, "If ever I saw her in all my life, I saw her this night."

One of those to whom she made the relation (Mary the wife of J. Sweet) had a messenger who came from Mulling that forenoon, to let her know her neighbour Goffe was dying, and desired to speak with her; she went over the same day, and found her just departing. The mother, amongst other discourse, related to her how much her daughter had longed to see her children, and said she had seen them. This brought to Mrs. Sweet's mind, what the nurse had told her that morning, for, till then, she had not thought fit to mention it, but disguised it, rather as the woman's disturbed imagination.

The substance of this, I had related to me by John Carpenter, the father of the deceased, next day after the burial. July 2, I fully discoursed the matter with the nurse and two neighbours, to whose house she went that morning.

Two days after, I had it from the mother, the minister that was with her in the even, and the woman who sat up with her that last night: they all agree in the same story, and every one helps to strengthen the other's testimony.

They all appear to be sober, intelligent persons, far enough off from designing to impose a cheat upon the world, or to manage

a lie, and what temptation they should lie under for so doing, I cannot conceive.

THOMAS TILSON,
Minister of Aylesford, near Maidstone in Kent.

This circumstance, and there are many like it, presents incontrovertible evidence of a separate spiritual existence. 1. She was in a trance, to appearance dead. 2. She was herself conscious, and related the next day to her mother where she was, and what she saw. 3. The nurse of the children testified before she knew that the dying woman had said she was there, that she saw her there with her children. 4. The circumstance is well authenticated.

Some will probably object to this evidence, because the person was not dead; and will not admit of it as evidence that the spirit can be conscious after death. To meet this, we present the following, where the man was dead. And yet the spirit visibly appeared and conversed.

SPIRITUAL APPEARANCE.

We give the following narration as an illustration of the scriptural recognition of the fact that spirits have in former ages appeared, and that they have not flesh and bones. The narrator was Samuel Drew, a native of Plymouth, Mass., but for many years a resident in this city. He died here in February last. He has frequently related the facts to the writer, in the presence of others. His veracity cannot be doubted by any who enjoyed his acquaintance. The circumstances were such as to render it impossible for it to be an optical illusion; for he not only *saw*, but *heard*, and responded to his questions. It could not have been a living man, for he handled the form of a hand, and it had no substance of flesh and bones. And such, our Saviour declared is the fact with a spirit. Again, there was no possibility of the apparition escaping, had it been a living man, for his daughter was on the stairs coming up when the spirit disappeared, and he immediately searched the chamber to find him if he was there. Finally, a murder had been committed in that chamber, and the spirit of the murdered man had been frequently seen there by different persons. We shall relate it as nearly as we can in his own language.

To be continued.

"I lived in a house at the corner of Shippen and Crabb Street. I was weaving in the attic chamber, which embraced the entire upper part of the house. My loom was by the side of the stairway, and rather juttet over it. I was sitting in my loom one evening, weaving by candle light; my wife and eldest daughter were below, my wife just recovering from the small-pox, and my daughter winding bobbins for me, which she from time to time brought up to me. There was a door at the foot of the stairs which opened very hard, and made a great deal of noise in opening. While engaged in weaving, I saw a man coming up the stairs, but heard no one open the door before he came up. He came to the top of the stairs, and stopping opposite to me with one foot on the chamber floor, and the other on the top stair, turned toward me. I bowed and said, How do you do? He returned the compliment and reached out his hand as if to shake hands. I in turn held out mine to take hold of his; but when I grasped what appeared to be his hand, I felt nothing. He then said, 'My wife informs me that you followed the seas in your younger days.' I said, 'Yes, I did so many years.' He asked, 'In what vessels did you sail?' After answering him, he remarked, 'I followed the seas when I was a young man.' I was about to ask him in what vessels he had sailed, and had the question on my tongue's end, when my daughter opened the door at the foot of the stairs, and came up. As soon as the door moved, he vanished and I saw him no more. When my daughter came up, I asked her if she met any one on the stairs; she said 'No. Was there anybody up here?' I told her no matter, she might go down; after she was gone, I took my light and searched the chamber through, thinking if any one had played a trick on me I would find him. But I could find no one. I went down and asked my wife if any one had been in that evening, or been up stairs. She said no. I then went up stairs to a lady by the name of Brown, who lived in the chamber, and asked her the same question and received the same answer. I then told her what had taken place. 'Oh,' said she, 'that was old Mr. —, who was murdered in that chamber where your bed stands; and he has been seen by many persons since his death.' He usually appeared about that time (near Christmas) every year." We give below the certificate of Mrs. Patterson, the daughter of Mr. Drew, who went up stairs at the time of disappearance of the spirit. The circumstance happened in December, 1826.

"I distinctly recollect the foregoing circumstance so far as I was concerned, and have often heard my father relate the story. He was not, up to that time, a believer in apparitions.

Philadelphia, March 20, 1850. ELIZABETH P. PATTERSON."

VERACITY OF FAMILIAR SPIRITS.

AN important question to be settled in reference to these familiar spirits is, what is their character for veracity? Can their testimony always be relied upon? We are commanded not to believe every spirit, but to "try the spirits whether they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." If we deny all existence and action of spiritual agents, there can be no trial of them. But if they prove, by indisputable evidence, as they have done in Rochester, that they do exist, the way is open to investigate their character. We are to know them by their fruits.

What are these fruits? They profess their mission to be good, and that they do good by instructing us in what we could not know by any of the ordinary means of obtaining knowledge.

We will test them by the testimony of their friends, chroniclers, and advocates, Messrs. Capron and Barrilon. On page 65, "Singular Revelations," in discussing the question, "Are they good or evil spirits?" they say, "But, says one, you get contradictory answers." This is true; or, rather, there are answers obtained which do not accord with the facts as the time transpires."

This confession is precisely met by the Divine test. Deut. xviii. 21, 22: "And if thou say in thy heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him." If they thus prove themselves either ignorant or vicious, no matter which, it is unsafe to depend on their testimony. But the authors assign several causes which may produce this result. The following remarks will give their views:

"We see no reason for supposing that, because a man has passed from this stage of existence, he has become at once the most perfect of prophets, without regard to his condition here. . . . There are, undoubtedly, spirits who desire to be noticed, and to answer questions, who are too ignorant to give any instruction, and who would be as likely to tell right as wrong. We do not believe these to be wilfully vicious; these errors arise from their ignorance, and we are answered that they will ultimately progress to a state of intelligence, purity, and happi-

ness, equal to those who pass from here under more favourable circumstances. Swedenborg says there are some spirits so ignorant that they do not know but they are the ones called for, when another is meant. This may be so. We are inclined to think it is, for we have known attempts to be made to imitate the signal which we always get when we call for a friend. Nearly every person who has called frequently for some particular spirit gets a signal whereby that particular spirit is known. This signal is different for different spirits, and although it is frequently attempted, we have never known these signals imitated. We do not think there is danger of being deceived by ignorant spirits when a person becomes acquainted with these communications. The sound made by an ignorant spirit is quite different from the others. *While the sound made by intelligent spirits is clear and lively, the sound made by the ignorant ones is low and muffled, like the striking of the hand on a carpet.* We are confident that, with due caution and care, intelligent and upright individuals will get correct answers. Much depends upon the mind and disposition of persons at the time of asking the questions, for, as all the Universe goes by affinities, it needs a pure mind, calm thinker, and deliberate questioner to get communications from spirits of a high order."

We regard this as an important disclosure of the art. We wish to be understood on this subject. We do not charge these spirits with being the devil, we do not believe they are; but are willing to accord to them the character they claim, of being human spirits; and to receive the facts related of their sayings and doings as true. Nor do we charge those with whom the rapping originated, with sin, on account of their endeavours to find out the cause of the disturbance in their house; because it is what all are liable to meet. There are many houses in the city of Philadelphia which we have good authority for believing to be disturbed by the same means. But we do say, that when either that or any other family or individual invited or accepted and encouraged their presence or abode with them, they trod on forbidden ground, and it became a moral wrong.

We learn from the foregoing quotation:

1. That those who deal with these spirits do call for particular persons or friends.
2. That they are frequently imposed on by other spirits who profess to be the ones called for.
3. That some spirits are ambitious to be noticed, but yet, through ignorance, would be as likely to tell wrong as right.

From these concessions it is evident that the art is now practised the same as it was in the days of Saul, king of Israel. The woman to whom he resorted had a familiar spirit, and others visited her for the purpose of obtaining information on various subjects. By means of that familiar, she used divination, and also practised necromancy, or called up and had communion with the dead. The Lord was departed from Saul, and answered him no more by the wonted means which he had appointed for his people, and he resorted to a practice which the law of God forbids. He went to the woman who had the familiar spirit, and said, "Divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me up whom I shall name unto thee." She asked who he wanted, and he said, "Bring me up Samuel." 1 Sam. xxviii. 12—19. "And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid, for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What form is he of? And she said, An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams: therefore, I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me: for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thy hand, and given it to thy neighbour, even to David. Because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines."

We have here a parallel to what is daily transacted in western New York; and we only speak as the oracles of God when we say that these spiritual developments are a revival of an old art, the practice of which is forbidden by the law of God. Our first objection to the practice, therefore, is, that it is in itself a

palpable violation of God's commandments, and is a sin against him.

Our next objection is, that either on account of their ignorant or vicious character, those spirits cannot be depended upon. There are matters of the highest moment, which, if they are at all consulted, they will be called to decide; questions affecting the life, liberty, character, and property of the community. They have not, perhaps, as yet attained such an influence over the public mind as to sway the decisions of our judicial tribunals. But who does not see that, just in proportion as they extend their influence, they will interfere with such subjects, and ruin, perhaps for life, the reputation of the innocent.

Some facts which have occurred in the history of animal magnetism, so called, will serve our purpose as illustrations. A gentleman of our acquaintance lost some money. He applied to a clairvoyant for information as to its fate. She proceeded to describe the person of a lady so particularly, that he recognised her as one who had been in his employ; and she was charged with the theft. He returned home, took her aside, and stated the case to her. She protested against the proceeding, and asserted her innocence. But it was in vain; he had received so correct an account of the affair, he could not be persuaded otherwise. But having no other evidence of the fact, he could take no legal measures. Time passed on—while she endured the extreme of anguish at the thought of lying under such a charge. After about two weeks, a man came forward, confessed himself the thief, and restored the money; saying that he had found no rest during the time he had it. The lady, in this instance, was providentially relieved of the imputation, or she must have carried the load through life.

Another case: Mr. ——— had been engaged in business which required many copper-plates. After his decease they were sold; one of some value could not be found. The purchaser was told if he could find it, he should have it. He consulted a clairvoyant: she described the person of a relative of the deceased, said he had taken it; described and located his house, where she said it could be found. The house was found, but the man had moved; she traced him from place to place, for he had moved in a short time to several places, till he was found, and the charge was made that he had the plate. He denied it, and took the man in to search his house. Not finding it, the gentleman went to different printing-offices where he supposed work had been done on the plate, and at length found

it, where it had been left after a job of printing had been performed. This was a most specious case; much that she told was true, and it was reasonable to believe all was. But such was not the fact. Had not the plate been found, however, the imputation must have remained.

That many crimes have been detected by such means, is not disputed; but such facts as those above related, should induce all to pause and ask, "Is it right for me to encourage a practice which is so liable to lead to such results?" Remember, you may be the next victim! All the dangers attending clairvoyant examinations must also attach themselves to the Rochester spirits. "*What they say does not,*" say our authors, "*always correspond with facts!*" Who, then, will jeopardize his own or his neighbour's interest by consulting agents of a character so doubtful?

It is not, however, in this department the chief danger lies. In their theological teachings, they deal in matters affecting not the temporal only, but eternal interests of men. But, say Messrs. Capron and Barrilon, "*We know of those who think their theological teaching wrong, but that cannot be proved.*"

Is it thus, that we cannot prove a theological sentiment? Must we always remain in the dark in reference to another world, and the fate awaiting us there until we find our state fixed? It is evident that their teachings do not accord with the word of God; and as that word directs us to compare the teachings of familiar spirits with "the law and the testimony, and if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them;" we turn to that blessed source of truth and salvation, and try their doctrines.

1. "They say that all persons pass to a condition superior to that which they occupied here, on their leaving the body."—*Singular Revelations*, p. 68.

But Christ taught, Luke xvi., that "a certain rich man, who fared sumptuously every day, died, and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." Quite a difference this.

2. They say, or one of them says, "hell is man's own body, and when he escapes from that he escapes from bondage."

But Jesus Christ taught that a man who had his good things in his lifetime, died, and was tormented in a flame, in view of the state of blessedness, which he was not permitted to enjoy.

They teach that a man escapes hell and bondage when he leaves the body. But Peter teaches that the spirits of the disobedient are in prison. Which shall we credit?

They predict future events which never come to pass. "There are answers obtained in regard to coming events which do not accord with the facts as the time transpires."—*Singular Revelations*. Whereas, Christ's predictions have never been known to fail.

According, therefore, to our rule, Isa. viii., there is no light in them. No professed believer in the divine authority of the Bible can evade this conclusion. It matters not whether it is through ignorance or viciousness that this discrepancy exists; in either case they are unsafe guides in theology.

But who are these spirits that give such responses? They reply, George Fox, W. E. Channing, John Wesley, Lorenzo Dow, and many others. But how do you know, gentlemen, that they are the veritable spirits of those men? We know by the sound of the signal, which is peculiar to each spirit. "Swedenborg says there are some spirits so ignorant that they do not know but that they are the ones called for, when another is meant. This may be so; we are inclined to think it is, for we have known attempts made to imitate a signal which we always get when we call for a friend."—*Sing. Rev.*, p. 66.

If this is so, and one spirit will attempt to pass himself off for another, and be so intent on his purpose as to endeavour to imitate the signal of the other, it argues something more than an ignorance of his own name. And there is strong grounds for suspecting that the pretensions set up to be John Wesley, Lorenzo Dow, &c., are efforts of the same character. They are manifestly seducing spirits, and every Christian should flee from them, and resist their influence.

PROOF THAT FAMILIAR SPIRITS ARE HUMAN.—NECROMANCY.

On page 14, we quoted and remarked upon Isaiah viii. 19; but now revert to the subject for the purpose of establishing the fact there recognised by comparing it with another art. In the divine prohibition, Deut. xviii. 9—12, necromancy, as well as consultation with familiar spirits, is positively forbidden. "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son to pass through the fire, . . . or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a *necromancer*." Necromancy is derived from the Greek words, *nekros*, dead, and *mantis*, a diviner. The Greek, *Nekromantia*, is thus defined: "The revealing future events by communication with the dead; necromancy." *Nekromantis*, is defined as follows: "One who reveals future events by communication with the dead; a necro-

mancer. We appeal to all who profess reverence for the Bible as the word of God, would it not be solemn mockery for the Divine Being to pass a prohibition of a thing that does not and cannot, in the nature of things, exist? And yet, if the dead have no intelligent spirit which remains in a state of consciousness, the thing is impossible. But the practice did exist among the old Canaanites. "Because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee." There is no escape from this argument in proof of the existence of the spirits of the dead. Were there not another to be adduced from the whole Bible, this is conclusive.

In the light of this, we turn again to Isaiah viii. 19. "When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter; should not a people seek unto the Lord their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them." Why does the Lord ask the question, "For the living to the dead?" Clearly and only because the familiar spirits, previously referred to, are the spirits of the dead. The question cannot be explained on any other hypothesis. We present these two arts, as practised in ancient times, and revived in our own day, in proof of a spiritual existence of man after death, firmly believing the argument to be invulnerable. But, says one, "I do not believe the practice was any thing more than a pretension to divine by communication with the dead, and that the people were deceived by such pretenders. The objection amounts to this: You believe the Lord forbade them to do what they could not and did not perform; instead of calling it a deception, and forbidding its practice as such. Yet there is no hint given within the sacred pages that it was a deception; but the reality of the practice is recorded as a matter of history, in the case of Saul and the witch of Endor.

It is hardly possible for any candid man to examine this single point, and not be satisfied of a spiritual existence in man which survives the body. It was a forcible remark made by one who had been an able advocate of materialism: "Had I as carefully weighed the evidence of the existence of the soul after death before I embraced the contrary sentiment, as I have since done the other side, I should never have entertained the views I have advocated." And such, we doubt not, is the fact with materialists in general. They hold to the spirituality of man's nature because it is the prevailing sentiment, without investi-

gating the subject to know why they believe. The doctrine of materialism is presented, and they are taken with its speciousness; and in endeavouring to fortify themselves, cannot candidly weigh the arguments and evidences on the other side of the question. But let them spend as much time and labour to prove the one as the other, and there is no doubt which way the scale will turn; few materialists, we are persuaded, would be found.

It will be objected, "If these spirits are so dangerous, would it not be better to leave them unnoticed, and reject their existence, than to bring them into notoriety by narrating these phenomena?"

We reply, to reject their existence is futile and absurd. What thousands of living witnesses have seen, felt, and heard, is not to be so easily frowned down. The existence of the phenomena is notorious, and, what is more, these manifestations are rapidly on the increase; so that from Rochester, they have spread into all that region of country, and into Canada, Pennsylvania, &c. A man might as well stand by and behold his house in flames, and deny that it was on fire at all! We confess we are among the number of those who look with deep concern on this development of spiritual energy, as constituting one of the grand systems of deception in the great conflict which is before us, and is to transpire between Christ and Antichrist. The apostle Paul, 2 Thess. ii., informs us that the coming of the man of sin, or full development of the mystery of iniquity, is like the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish. To attempt to frown down, or pass over with contempt or ridicule, such a subject, is most unwise. Let the truth be known, and then meet it with such armour as the word of God affords. If it cannot be met by such a course, let it remain unanswered.

SCRIPTURAL ILLUSTRATION OF A TRANCE.

The record of a trance, (page 30,) is so fully authenticated as to command respect and consideration. The account was written by a well known clergyman of Aylesworth, in the county of Kent, England, and addressed to, and published first by Rev. Richard Baxter, and afterward by Rev. John Wesley. The names of persons and places are given, with day and date. The clergyman was acquainted with all the parties, and carefully

examined each one who survived at the time of writing. If one spirit has, in trance, left the body and been consciously in another place, and was visibly seen in that place at the time alleged, then others may do the same. And these facts are an irrefutable argument in favour of a spiritual existence out of the body. If this fact is admitted, the argument is at an end. "But," says the Materialist, "I will admit no authority but the Bible; and your cause must be weak indeed, to require such things for its support." We reply, we have never yet entertained a thought that the Bible would clash with any well authenticated fact. And a system which requires the rejection of facts for its existence, is at least suspicious. We believe the Bible to be a perfect system of truth, and that every existing and established fact will harmonize with its testimony. We shall make our appeal with all boldness and confidence to stern matters of fact, as they are recorded in the Bible, or have existed in the world in past ages, or now exist. We have presented the history of a trance. Do the Scriptures recognise such facts? We reply, *they do*.

ST. JOHN WAS CONSCIOUS OUT OF THE BODY.

John, in the book of Revelation, has recorded at least four facts which occurred to himself. The first is Rev. i. 10: "I was IN SPIRIT on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." In this text, we have omitted the word "the," because it is not in the original, neither is it in the three other texts we shall quote; although our translators have supplied it in each text, as though it were in the original; each, however, reads thus,—*en pneumati, in spirit*.

John's record of himself, therefore, is, that he was *in spirit*, or his spirit was freed from his body, and in that spiritual state he was shown a variety of facts or symbols, which were explained to him. He was in spirit, and yet was conscious. If John could be in spirit, as he says he was, and yet be conscious, so, also, might Mrs. Mary Goffe, and also many others.

We pass, however, to Rev. iv. 2: "And immediately I was IN SPIRIT: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne." This was a trance or transition, from earth to heaven; not in body, but IN SPIRIT. He was called up there; and he was in spirit and went there. The whole vision of the seals and trumpets was presented to him while in this trance. The spirit of John was, therefore, conscious while absent from the body.

The third instance of this spiritual transition is recorded, Rev. xvii. 1, 3: "Come hither; I will show unto thee the judg-

ment of the great whore. So he carried me away IN SPIRIT into the wilderness: and I saw a woman," &c. He was not taken in body, but *in spirit* into the wilderness.

The next text, relating to the subject, is Rev. xxi. 10: "Come hither; I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he carried me away IN SPIRIT to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God."

In the light of these four instances of spiritual transition from one place to another, we will turn to the case of Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 2—4: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter:" John positively testifies that he was in spirit; but Paul is equally certain of being in paradise, but uncertain whether he was in the body or out of the body. These passages together prove that a man can be as conscious in spirit out of the body, as he can in the body. This last named text has been frequently quoted in proof of a state of consciousness out of the body; and it has never yet been met by those who deny the separate existence of the spirit. They have retorted, and covered up in a measure the weakness of the spot; but never presented any thing worthy of being called argument against it; and some, at least, know it. But if this is unanswerable, the four instances recorded by John are much more strong.

THE FORMS OF THIS PHENOMENA ARE VARIOUS.

The first form is *divine*, and produced by a direct action of the Holy Spirit, or some angelic messenger, as in the case of John. 1. His attention was arrested by a voice calling to him, "Come up hither." 2. As he instantaneously yielded his will to the call, he was entranced, and his spirit set free, that he might comply.

The second form is human agency, called

ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

We cannot, at present, enter into this subject as fully as we design to do hereafter; but shall simply glance at the fact, that the history of the Mesmeric art presents many thousands or millions of cases of trance or clairvoyance produced by human in-

strumentality. Mingled with a great amount of deception, there is no doubt in our mind but there is such a thing as independent clairvoyance, in which the subject, uncontrolled by the operator, visits and takes cognizance of facts in distant and diverse places. Nor has this opinion been hastily formed, nor facts taken upon trust. We have taken the means to test and know, personally, the truth in the case, by numerous experiments, under a variety of circumstances. The testimony of thousands is, that in a state of clairvoyance, the spirit leaves the body, and goes to the place described, sees, hears and apprehends. In addition to these forms, there is

A VOLUNTARY TRANCE,

In which the individual, by an act or volition of the mind, induces a state of trance similar to a state of clairvoyance, and the spirit goes to any place which it wills to visit. This power was undoubtedly possessed and exercised by Immanuel Swedenborg, and is also by Andrew Jackson Davis, of Poughkepsie, N. Y.

A case of this kind is related by Stilling, an eminent German author, of the first part of the present century. We had heard the circumstances related, coming from persons who were acquainted with it, before meeting with Stilling's account. The circumstance transpired many years ago in Blackwoodtown, N. J. He does not give the name of the place definitely, but locates it near Philadelphia.

The substance of his account is, that "a young man from his neighbourhood emigrated to America, and established himself as a miller, near the Delaware, below Philadelphia. After some years he returned to Germany, and related the following circumstance:—The captain of a vessel left home on a voyage to Europe. When he departed, he promised his wife to write at a given time, and remit some funds. The time passed by, and no funds or letter came. The wife became exceedingly anxious for her husband's safety. Some of her friends advised her to go to a man who resided by himself in a very retired manner, interfering but little with the affairs of the world or mingling in their society. She concluded to follow their advice and went. She related her object in calling, and wished to know if he could give her any information. He replied he would see about that, and went into another room. After waiting some time, she became weary of her suspense, and went to a window in the door which separated the two rooms, and, drawing the curtain, looked

through to see where he was. She saw him laid upon a seat apparently in a sound sleep. She sat down and waited till he came out; when he told her that her husband was then in London, at a certain Coffee-house, in good health, and informed her the reason why he had neither written nor sent the money. That he designed to sail for home immediately. She returned home to await the issue. In due time, her husband arrived. Before asking any questions, or giving her husband time to inform her on the subject, she proceeded to state to him why he had not written or sent the money; and also to tell him where he was on a certain day, while in London. He seemed surprised, and wished to know how she came by her information. On being informed of her adventure and inquiries, he remarked that he must see the man. And both himself and wife went again to visit him. When introduced to him, he was startled, and said, that is the very man who came to me in London, and conversed with me on those points, and I gave him that information."* This is in substance the story related by Stilling and others. Having it from so many different sources, we cannot but regard the narrative as being substantially true; and it affords another strong proof of the existence of the human spirit in a state of consciousness out of the body.

THE NATURE OF THE SOUL.

The terms soul and spirit are so nearly synonymous that they are frequently confounded one with the other. Yet the Scriptures use them each as constituting distinct elements in man's nature. Thus, the Apostle Paul teaches, 1 Thess. v. 23: "And I pray God your WHOLE SOUL, AND SPIRIT, AND BODY, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The distinction between the parts is here made prominent. If there is a distinction between the two, in what does it consist? We have already presented the scriptural evidence that the spirit is the intelligent principle or agent in man; and shall now proceed to show that the soul (*psuche*,) is the living or animating principle or agent. It is thus defined in the Polymicrian Greek Lexicon to the New Testament: "*Psuche*, breath, life, i. e. the animal soul, principle of life, Luke xii. 19, 20. Acts xx. 10: life, i. e., the state of being alive, existence spoken, of natural

* The foregoing story is related in *The Theory of the Knowledge of Spirits*, by Dr. John Henry Jung Stilling, Germ. edition, 1827, page 60.

life, Matt. ii. 20; vi. 25; and by implication, of life extending beyond the grave, Matt. x. 39; John xii. 25; *meton*, that which has life, a living creature, living being, 1 Cor. xv. 45; *spoken of* a man, person, individual, Acts ii. 41; *pase psuche*, every man, every person, every one, Acts ii. 43; souls in a separate state of being, Rev. vi. 9; xx. 4; *from the Hebrew*, a slave, Rev. xviii. 13; the soul, i. e., the rational soul, mind, that in us which thinks, feels, wills, and renders us immortal, viz., the soul, mind, &c., as the seat of the desires, affections, volitions, &c., Matt. xi. 29; xxii. 37; xxvi. 38; *Genr.*, the soul, spirit, the spiritual part of man, with all its soul and faculties," &c. In all these various senses, the word *psuche*, soul, is used in the New Testament. But from the text already quoted, and Heb. iv. 12, "The word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the SOUL AND SPIRIT," &c., we learn that a distinction does exist between the soul and spirit; and although philosophy may fail to make such a distinction, yet the word of God is so keen as to pierce between and divide them asunder. The soul, then, in its true primary signification, is the life, or living animating principle; while the spirit is properly the intelligent principle. The term, *psuche*, is used in the following texts in the sense of life: Matt. ii. 20: "They are dead which sought the young child's (*psuche*) life." It is used in the same sense, Luke xii. 19, 20: "I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years," &c. "But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." The import of the text is, "I will say to my *life*, or living principle, thou hast enough to sustain thee in the body many years; enjoy these provisions." Thus, the whole man is supposed to address this living principle within him. But God's purposes were the reverse of this; he said, "Thou fool, this night thy soul, or life, shall be required of thee." That living principle should leave the body, and all earthly enjoyments be at an end. These texts are sufficient for illustration, and those who are interested to pursue the subject further, can do so by the assistance of a concordance.

The soul is spoken of as a principle not necessarily dependent on its connexion with the body for its existence. This fact is taught in Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the SOUL: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both SOUL and BODY in hell." Thus the Saviour recognises the fact, that the body may be killed, and at the same time the life, or living principle, survive.

But it is frequently said, "The term soul, signifies THE PERSON." True, it does frequently have that sense; BUT THAT IS ITS FIGURATIVE AND NOT LITERAL MEANING. There is no figure of speech more common than a *synechdoche*, by which a part is used for the whole, or the whole for a part; the container for the thing contained, &c. Thus, we wish a glass of water, instead of using the entire phrase, we use the figure, a part for the whole, and say, "reach me that glass," or "reach me that water." So when the term soul is used to designate the person, it is used in this same figurative sense, a part for the whole. Acts ii. 41: "There were added unto them about three thousand SOULS." Also, Acts xxvii. 37: "And we were all in the ship, two hundred, three-score and sixteen souls." In both these texts, the term is used in its figurative and not literal sense, and signifies persons. So, also, Gen. ii. 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," or person; or, he became a person possessed of life or soul. Not that the whole man or person was soul or life, any more than the whole of what we call for is glass, when we wish for a glass of water. The body is not soul or life, but it is animated by the living principle, or soul. We are the more particular in dwelling on this point, because, of late years, in the discussion which has been carried on in reference to the nature and destiny of man, the fact of this figurative use has been studiously avoided, and the last quoted passage referred to as an instance of the literal and primary use of the term. The circumstance that this is the first instance of the occurrence of the term soul in the Bible, has been used to make that view the more impressive. It is well known that the mass of men do not reason closely on such points and unravel their sophistry.

Had the record of the fact of man's creation been made at that moment, before language had become mature, and terms well defined and understood, the first use of the term would unquestionably have been its primary use. But such was not the fact. The history of that transaction was not written till about twenty-five hundred years afterward, when human language had become matured, and its laws established; and the Bible, the history of the past as well as the existing, and the predictions of the future, was all written in accordance with the laws of language as they then existed. According to those laws, the term soul was used in its primary sense, as it now is, for the life or living principle. Moses used the term in that sense, in record-

ing the death of Rachel. Gen. xxxv. 18: "And it came to pass as her SOUL was departing, (for she died,) she called," &c. The soul is here recognised as a principle susceptible of departure from the body, and hence, is not the body. "True," it will be replied, "it is the living principle that departs from the body, and that principle is the breath." We answer, whatever it is, it cannot be killed by man who can kill the body. So that out of the body it is as truly life, and alive, as while in the body. Let this be well considered.

From the foregoing we arrive at this result: that the term *psuche*, soul, primarily signifies the life; and that, when otherwise employed, it is used in a figurative, and not literal sense.

RELATION BETWEEN SOUL AND SPIRIT.

Another use of the term *psuche*, soul, is to signify the mind, that within us which thinks, feels, wills, &c. Matt. xxii. 37: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Also, Luke i. 46: "My soul doth magnify the Lord." The inquiry will naturally arise, "If the soul is the life, and the spirit the intelligent principle, how is it that the same attributes are ascribed to one which belong to the other?"

There is evidently a most intimate connexion between the soul and spirit, and they are combined to constitute the spiritual nature of man, not only while in the body, but also during their absence from the body. And hence, the terms soul and spirit are used interchangeably, the one for the other, or one for both, according to the figure already noticed, where a part is used for the whole. Thus, when Peter referred to them that are dead, who "live according to (or like) God in spirit," it is evident he understood the soul or life to cleave to the spirit, The two terms are used interchangeably. 1 Kings xvii. 21, 22, and Luke viii. 35: "O Lord, my God, I pray thee let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah, and the SOUL of the child came into him again, and he revived." "And her SPIRIT came again, and she arose straightway." It is evident that the terms soul and spirit are here used interchangeably, and embrace both parts; each of which are said to have left the body at death.

But however close may be their connexion, and similar their nature, the quick and powerful word of God divides them asunder, or makes a distinction between the two.

We now come to the grand question involved in this discussion:—

IS THE SOUL OF MAN IMMORTAL?

Before attempting a solution of this question, we must first settle the meaning of the terms *immortal*, *immortality*, &c.

The Apostle Paul has made use of these terms, and we turn to him to learn the sense in which he uses them. 1 Tim. i. 17, he says, "Now, unto the King ETERNAL, IMMORTAL, INVISIBLE, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever, Amen." In this text, the Greek word, rendered *immortal*, is *aphtharto*, and properly signifies incorruptibility, as opposed to the *corruptibility* of the human body, as in 1 Cor. xv. 54: "For this corruptible, (*phtharton*,) must put on *incorruption*," (*aphtharsian*.) The term here is applied to the body, in reply to the question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" Ver. 42: "It is sown in corruption, (*phthora*,) raised in incorruption," (*aphtharsia*.) The word should, therefore, have been rendered, "Now, unto the King eternal, *incorruptible*, invisible," &c., rather than *immortal*. We pass from this text to 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16: "Until the appearing of Jesus Christ. Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto," &c. In this instance, the original word used is *athanasian*, and signifies deathless and endless existence. It embraces the unoriginated existence and *eternity* of being of the only wise God, here said to be Jesus Christ.

If asked, Is the soul of man immortal in this sense? we reply, certainly not; for the only wise God only hath that attribute.

But if asked, If the soul of man is immortal in the popular acceptance of the term, that is, as we understand it, that there is in it no natural tendency to dissolution, or cessation of animation, and that it does survive the death of the body, and is destined to live for ever? we most unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative. But we now reverse the question, and ask,

IS THE SOUL OF MAN MORTAL?

The burden now falls on the Materialist, who denies the immortality of the soul, because the Bible does not in so many words call it immortal, to prove that it is ever said in so many words to be MORTAL. The truth is, neither *mortality* nor *immortality* are ever affirmed of the soul or spirit, but always of

the body. Nor is there such a term used in the Bible as a dead soul or dead spirit; but many references to the dead body. It is said the body, without the spirit, is dead; but no where are we told that the spirit, without the body, is dead. We conclude, therefore, that neither the soul nor spirit do die in the sense of cessation of conscious or active being. The only sense in which they die in temporal death, is in the sense of separation from the body.

But we shall probably be reminded, that the Lord by Ezekiel declared, chap. xviii. 20: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." To this we reply, the term is used, not in its literal, but in its figurative sense in that passage, to signify the person, as is shown by the remainder of the verse. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." It is thus manifest that death is not affirmed of the soul as the abstract principle of life; but of the person who sins, as such. Again, the text refers, not to temporal death, for that is passed upon all men as a consequence of Adam's transgression, and death reigns over those who have never personally sinned. The threatening, therefore, must refer to the second death, which will be inflicted for personal transgressions.

Is it asked, "If death is threatened to the whole person, of which the soul forms a part, how that person can die, and yet the soul, a part of the person, escape?" We reply, in the second death, both soul and body are cast into hell, or into the lake of fire and brimstone, and have part there. Rev. xxi. 8. In this sense, "every soul of man that doeth evil" will die. But this has no bearing on the abstract principle of life, called the soul, in temporal death. The Saviour, let it be borne in mind, has settled this point, that man can kill the body, but is not able to kill the soul. But God is able, after he hath killed, to cast into hell.

But we will suppose, for the sake of illustration, that it is the death penalty, as affixed to some of the statutes of the Lord by Moses, which is here intended, and that the guilty persons are designated *souls*. How can the soul, in the sense of person, die, and yet the components of that person, any of them, remain alive?

This is probably the strongest form in which the difficulty can be presented; and we will endeavour to meet it fairly and honestly.

That may be truly affirmed of a whole which cannot be of its parts, and the reverse. We will take a simple illustration of the principle, as it exists in nature.

Pure water is composed of two simple elements, neither of which can be decomposed or rendered more simple, Oxygen and Hydrogen gas. These have no tendency to spontaneous change, while kept in their pure and simple form. Neither of them alone would ever putrefy or corrupt. When combined with no other foreign substance intermixed, they form water and remain INCORRUPTIBLE. FOR PERFECTLY PURE WATER HAS NO TENDENCY TO SPONTANEOUS CHANGE. But as soon as earthy matter is introduced into that water, there exists a tendency to spontaneous change or corruption. We take a vessel of water in this state, and say of it, that it is stagnant, corrupt, or fetid. This is truly affirmed of the water as such, embracing all its elements. But in which of them do these objectionable qualities really exist? Not in the Oxygen, for by the application of the poles of a galvanic battery, that gas, and also the Hydrogen, are evolved, and are found to be the same simple elements they were before combination; and combined again, they produce pure water.

We next examine the earthy mass which remains, and find those offensive qualities remaining in it. Hence, we know the corruption to exist in it.

Thus it is with man. He is called, as a whole, "*mortal man*." But when he is analyzed, it is said, "*mortal body*." Rom. viii. Corruptible body; dead body, &c. In death, it is said, "*the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it*." They who are dead, "*live according to God in spirit*." The souls of the martyrs were seen by John, in heaven, under the altar. The body, man can kill; the soul, he cannot kill. We conclude, therefore, that—

The soul and spirit, or *psuche* and *pneuma*, are in themselves simple elements. Combined, they constitute a *living intelligence*, which has no tendency in itself to spontaneous change or decomposition. Like Oxygen and Hydrogen gas, they may exist in a state of incorruptibility, either combined or separate, when free from foreign and corruptible matter. The difference between the soul and spirit, and the two gases named, is, that the latter are inert and unintelligent, while THE BIBLE ascribes to the former life, activity and intelligence. While it is a chemical fact, that the two gases may exist in incorruption, either combined or separate, revelation says the same of soul and spirit.

The sense, therefore, in which the soul dies, when the term is used figuratively for the whole person, is, that a separation of the constituents of the person takes place, and the functions of the living person cease. If the soul and spirit cease their conscious and active existence at death, how is it that they are never called mortal, while that term is applied to the body in several instances? If the soul and spirit are dead when separate from the body, in the sense in which the body is, why are they never called the dead soul or the dead spirit? It is evident the inspired penman had no such idea as that the soul, at death, ceased to exist in active being.

THE SOUL AFTER DEATH IN THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

The Scriptures represent the soul as well as spirit, as retaining a personal existence and identity after death, not as *the person*, but as *the soul of the person*. The first text in proof of this, to which we refer, is Acts ii. 27, 31: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." "His soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption." In those texts, these two points are clearly manifest: 1. That the writer made a distinction between the soul and flesh. 2. That he regarded one the flesh, as naturally the subject of corruption, which only divine power prevented; and the other as in the natural course of events to remain in hell, but which divine power and goodness prevented, by accomplishing his resurrection. But there is no intimation that there was any natural tendency in the soul to corruption.

The meaning of the term *hell*, we, for the present, pass over, and leave it for future discussion.

We next turn to Rev. vi. 9—11: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." The fact here stands out prominently, that the subjects of this vision were not living men, but "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God," &c. This is a perfect illustration of Matt. x. 28: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Here, in heaven, for it was

in heaven the scene of vision was laid, the souls of them, whose bodies had been killed, were found in conscious anxiety awaiting the day of vengeance, when their blood would be avenged on them that dwell on the earth. They cried to God and received response, and also a pledge of their final recompense of reward. "White robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their brethren," &c.

But Rev. xx. 4, gives us another instance of the existence of the souls of deceased persons. They were not those persons or souls that were beheaded, but they were the SOULS OF THEM that were beheaded. "They lived," i. e., they returned to, and animated the bodies they had left. Thus, by these four texts, we prove the soul of man to have a personal existence and identity in the intermediate state, between death and the resurrection. It is impossible, by any just principles of criticism, to prove that the term soul or souls in either of those texts means the whole person; for in each text the construction shows it to refer to the soul as the abstract principle which is designated by that name. As to the parallel between the cry of the souls under the altar, and the blood of Abel, which cried to God from the ground, there is none. Nor are these souls represented, as some would have it, as being under the altar where they were put to death. There is no such intimation. As before remarked, the scene of the vision is laid in heaven. Rev. iv. 1—3. Here we are told by John that he was IN SPIRIT; at the Divine command, went in spirit to heaven; he saw the throne there set, and him that sat on it. There, visions of futurity passed before his spirit, and, among other scenes, he saw the fifth seal opened, and those SOULS under the altar. What altar was it? There is but one altar mentioned in the whole vision, and that is "the golden altar which was before the throne," from which the incense "went up before God out of the angel's hand." Chap. viii. 3, 4.

The golden altar before the throne in heaven, must, therefore, have been the altar under which he saw those souls. They are, therefore, when absent from the body, present with the Lord, as expressed by St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 8.

MEANS OF SPIRITUAL MANIFESTATION.

The question will occur, perhaps, If the soul and spirit of man have a real existence, why do we not see them when they leave the body? 1. They are spiritual substance, and, hence,

not the subjects of apprehension by physical senses. But when the spiritual sense is opened, we can see, hear, feel, &c. This is evident from the prayer of the prophet, 2 Kings vi. 17: "And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." In a state of mesmeric clairvoyance, the spiritual eyes are opened by human means. There are also some persons who seem to have the gift of second sight, as it is called, and to be able to discern spiritual beings.

2. Spirits probably have the power of rendering themselves visible by involving themselves in an aerial form at pleasure. This would seem to be the fact, from the circumstance that they usually are seen with clothes, in colour and form resembling what they wore when alive. In some instances, they have, at different times, appeared in different dresses.

We may as well ask, why can we not always see the electric fluid, if it exists all around us and in every object in nature, as to inquire why we cannot always see spiritual objects. There are natural and artificial means for developing the electric fluid, and rendering it visible; and the same is true of spiritual existences. And it would be just as reasonable to deny the existence of electricity, because we do not always see it, as to deny the existence of spirits, because they are not naturally visible.

SINGULAR FOREWARNING OF DEATH.

MISS LEE, whose narrative we give below, was the daughter of Sir Charles Lee. Her mother being dead, she spent some time with her aunt; and while there, this singular occurrence transpired. While in apparent good health, she one night dreamed twice that she was to die that day at twelve o'clock; on awakening her maid, she related her dreams; but she remarked, "it is only a dream; to which the young lady replied, it might be so, and composed herself again to sleep.

"About two o'clock, she was awaked again, and saw the apparition of a little woman, between the curtain and the pillow, who told her she was her mother; that she was happy, and that by twelve o'clock that day, she would be with her. On this, Miss Lee knocked again for her maid; called for her clothes, and when she was dressed, went into her closet, and

came not out till nine o'clock. She then brought with her a letter for her father, which she gave to her aunt, the Lady Everard, telling her what had happened, and desired that it might be sent to him, as soon as she was dead. But the Lady thought her niece was suddenly fallen delirious, and sent to Chelmsford for a physician and surgeon. When they came, the physician declared that he could discern no indication of what the Lady imagined, or of any indisposition of body. However, the Lady would needs have her let blood, which was done accordingly; and when the young lady had patiently let them do what they pleased with her, she desired the chaplain might be called to read prayers. When prayers were ended, she took her guitar and psalm-book, and sat down upon a chair without arms, and played, and sung so melodiously, that her music master, who was then there, wondered at it.

"Near twelve o'clock, she rose and sat herself down in a great chair with arms, and immediately expired, at Waltham, in Essex, three miles from Chelmsford.

"When the letter was sent to her father, in Warwickshire, he was afflicted that he came not to Waltham till she was buried; but when he came, he caused her to be taken up, and buried by her mother at Edminton, about the year 1662. This relation, the then Bishop of Gloucester had from Sir Charles Lee himself."

JOHN WESLEY ON APPARITIONS.

No man in modern times was probably a more firm believer in the visible appearance of disembodied spirits than the late Rev. John Wesley. In his preface to "A true relation of the chief things which an evil spirit did and said at Mascon, in Burgundy," he says: "With my latest breath will I bear my testimony against giving up to infidels one great proof of the invisible world; I mean, that of witchcraft and apparitions, confirmed by the testimony of all ages. I do not think any unprejudiced men can doubt the truth of the following narrative. The truth of it was in the last century acknowledged by all Europe; against which, the unaccountableness of it is no objection to those who are convinced of the littleness of their own knowledge."—*Wesley's Works*, -vol. 7, p. 571.

In his introduction to an account of ELIZABETH HOBSON, written in May, 1768, he thus remarks:—

•

“*Wednesday, 25*, and the two following days, being at Sunderland, I took down, from one who had feared God from her infancy, one of the strangest accounts I ever read; and yet I can find no pretence to disbelieve it. The well-known character of the person excludes all suspicion of fraud; and the nature of the circumstances themselves excludes the possibility of a delusion. It is true there are several of them which I do not comprehend; but this is, with me, a very slender objection: for what is it which I do comprehend, even of the things which I see daily? Truly not

The smallest grain of sand, or spire of grass.

I know not how the one grows, or how the particles of the other cohere together. What pretence have I then to deny well-attested facts, because I cannot comprehend them? It is true, likewise, that the English in general, and indeed most of the men of learning in Europe, have given up all accounts of witches and apparitions, as mere old wives' fables. I am sorry for it; and I willingly take this opportunity of entering my solemn protest against this violent compliment which so many that believe the Bible pay to those who do not believe it. I owe them no such service. I take knowledge, these are at the bottom of the outcry which has been raised, and with such insolence spread throughout the nation, in direct opposition, not only to the Bible, but the suffrage of the wisest and best of men in all ages and nations. They well know, (whether Christians know it or not,) that the giving up witchcraft is, in effect, giving up the Bible; and they know, on the other hand, that if but one account of the intercourse of men with separate spirits be admitted, their whole castle in the air (Deism, Atheism, Materialism,) falls to the ground. I know no reason, therefore, why we should suffer even this weapon to be wrested out of our hands. Indeed, there are numerous arguments besides, which abundantly confute their vain imaginations. But we need not be hooted out of one: neither reason nor religion require this.

“One of the capital objections to all these accounts, which I have known urged over and over, is this, ‘Did you ever see an apparition yourself?’ No, nor did I ever see a murder; yet I believe there is such a thing; yea, and that in one place or another, murder is committed every day. Therefore, I cannot, as a reasonable man, deny the fact; although I never saw it, and perhaps never may. The testimony of unexceptionable witnesses fully convinces me both of the one and the other. But

to set this aside, it has been confidently alleged, that many of these have seen their error, and have been clearly convinced that the supposed preternatural operation was the mere contrivance of artful men. The famous instance of this, which has been spread far and wide, was the drumming in Mr. Mompesson's house, at T'edworth; who, it was said, acknowledged it was all a trick, and that he had found out the whole contrivance. Not so: my eldest brother, then at Christ church, Oxon, inquired of Mr. Mompesson, his fellow collegian, whether his father had acknowledged this or not. He answered, 'The resort of gentlemen to my father's house was so great, he could not bear the expense. He, therefore, took no pains to confute the report that he had found out the cheat; although he, and I, and all the family, knew the account which was published to be punctually true.'

"This premised, I proceed to as remarkable a narrative as any that has fallen under my notice. The reader may believe it, if he pleases; or may disbelieve it, without any offence to me. Meantime, let him not be offended if I believe it, till I see better reason to the contrary.

"1. Elizabeth Hobson was born in Sunderland, in the year 1744. Her father dying when she was three or four years old, her uncle, Thomas Rea, a pious man, brought her up as his own daughter. She was serious from a child, and grew up in the fear of God. Yet she had deep and sharp convictions of sin, till she was about sixteen years of age, when she found peace with God, and from that time the whole tenor of her behaviour was suitable to her profession.

"On Wednesday, May 25, 1768, and the three following days, I talked with her at large; but it was with great difficulty I prevailed on her to speak. The substance of what she said was as follows:—

"2. From my childhood, when any of our neighbours died, whether men, women, or children, I used to see them, either just when they died, or a little before; and I was not frightened at all, it was so common. Indeed, many times I did not then know they were dead. I saw many of them by day, many by night. Those that came when it was dark, brought light with them. I observed all little children, and many grown persons, had a bright, glorious light round them. But many had a gloomy, dismal light, and a dusky cloud over them.

"3. When I told my uncle this, he did not seem to be at all

surprised at it; but at several times he said, 'Be not afraid; only take care to fear and serve God. As long as he is on your side, none will be able to hurt you.' At other times, he said, (dropping a word now and then, but seldom answering me any questions about it,) 'Evil spirits very seldom appear but between eleven at night and two in the morning; but after they have appeared to a person a year, they frequently come in the day-time. Whatever spirits, good or bad, come in the day, they come at sunrise, at noon, or at sunset.'

"4. When I was between twelve and thirteen, my uncle had a lodger, who was a very wicked man. One night I was sitting in my chamber about half hour after ten, having by accident put out my candle, when he came in, all over in a flame. I cried out, 'William, why do you come in so to fright me?' He said nothing, but went away. I went after him into his room, but found he was fast asleep in bed. A day or two after, he fell ill, and, within the week, died in raging despair.

"5. I was between fourteen and fifteen, when I went very early one morning to fetch up the kine. I had two fields to cross, into a low ground which was said to be haunted. Many persons had been frightened there, and I had myself often seen men and women (so many, at times, that they are out of count,) go just by me, and vanish away. This morning, as I came toward it, I heard a confused noise, as of many people quarrelling. But I did not mind it, and went on till I came near the gate. I then saw, on the other side, a young man dressed in purple, who said, 'It is too early; go back from whence you came. The Lord be with you, and bless you;' and presently he was gone.

"6. When I was about sixteen, my uncle fell ill, and grew worse and worse for three months. One day, having been sent out on an errand, I was coming home through a lane, when I saw him in the field, coming swiftly toward me. I ran to meet him; but he was gone. When I came home, I found him calling for me. As soon as I came to his bedside, he clasped his arms round my neck, and, bursting into tears, earnestly exhorted me to continue in the ways of God. He kept his hold, till he sunk down and died; and even then they could hardly unclasp his fingers. I would fain have died with him, and wished to be buried with him, dead or alive.

"7. From that time I was crying from morning to night, and praying that I might see him. I grew weaker and weaker, till one morning about one o'clock, as I was lying crying, as usual,

I heard some noise, and, rising up, saw him come to the bedside. He looked much displeased; shook his head at me, and in a minute or two went away.

"8. About a week after, I took my bed, and grew worse and worse; till, in six or seven days, my life was despaired of. Then, about eleven at night, my uncle came in, looked well pleased, and sat down on the bedside. He came every night after, at the same time, and stayed till cock-crowing. I was exceeding glad, and kept my eyes fixed upon him all the time he stayed. If I wanted drink or any thing, though I did not speak or stir, he fetched it, and set it on the chair by the bedside. Indeed, I could not speak; many times I strove, but could not move my tongue. Every morning, when he went away, he waved his hand to me, and I heard delightful music, as if many persons were singing together.

"9. In about six weeks, I grew better. I was then musing, one night, whether I did well in desiring he might come; and I was praying that God would do his own will, when he came in, and stood by the bedside. But he was not in his usual dress; he had on a white robe, which reached down to his feet. He looked quite pleased. About one, there stood by him a person in white, taller than he, and exceeding beautiful. He came with the singing as of many voices, and continued till near cock-crowing. Then my uncle smiled, and waved his hand toward me twice or thrice. They went away with inexpressibly sweet music, and I saw him no more.

"10. In a year after this, a young man courted me, and in some months we agreed to be married. But he purposed to take another voyage first, and one evening went aboard his ship. About eleven o'clock, going out to look for my mother, I saw him standing at his mother's door, with his hands in his pockets, and his hat pulled over his eyes. I went to him, and reached my hand to put up his hat; but he went swiftly by me, and I saw the wall, on the other side of the lane, part as he went through, and then immediately close after him. At ten the next morning he died.

"11. A few days after, John Simpson, one of our neighbours, a man that truly feared God, and one with whom I was particularly acquainted, went to sea, as usual. He sailed out on a Tuesday. The Friday night following, between eleven and twelve o'clock, I heard one walking in my room; and every step sounded as if he was stepping in water. He then came to the bedside, in his sea-jacket, all wet, and stretched his hand

over me. Three drops of water fell on my breast, and felt as cold as ice. I strove to wake his wife, who lay with me; but I could not, any more than if she was dead. Afterward, I heard he was cast away that night. In less than a minute he went away: but he came to me every night, for six or seven nights following, between eleven and two. Before he came, and when he went away, I always heard sweet music. Afterward, he came both day and night; every night about twelve, with the music at his coming and going, and every day at sunrise, noon, and sunset. He came, whatever company I was in; at church, in the preaching-house, at my class; and was always just before me, changing his posture as I changed mine. When I sat, he sat; when I kneeled, he kneeled; when I stood, he stood likewise. I would fain have spoke to him, but I could not; when I tried, my heart sunk within me. Mean time, it affected me more and more, so that I lost both my stomach, my colour, and my strength. This continued ten weeks, while I pined away, not daring to tell any one. At last he came four or five nights without any music, and looked exceeding sad. On the fifth night he drew the curtains of the bed violently to and fro, still looking wishfully at me, and as one quite distressed. This he did two nights. On the third, I lay down, about eleven, on the side of the bed. I quickly saw him walking up and down the room. Being resolved to speak to him, but unwilling any should hear, I rose, and went up into the garret. When I opened the door, I saw him walking toward me, and shrunk back; on which he stopped, and stood at a distance. I said, 'In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, what is your business with me?' He answered, 'Betsy, God forgive you for keeping me so long from my rest. Have you forgot what you promised before I went to sea—to look to my children, if I was drowned? You must stand to your word, or I cannot rest.' I said, 'I wish I was dead.' He said, 'Say not so; you have more to go through before then: and yet, if you knew as much as I do, you would not care how soon you died. You may bring the children on in their learning, while they live; they have but a short time.' I said, 'I will take all the care I can.' He added, 'Your brother has wrote for you to come to Jamaica; but if you go, it will hurt your soul. You have also thoughts of altering your condition; but if you marry him you think of, it will draw you from God, and you will neither be happy here nor hereafter. Keep close to God, and go on in the way wherein you have been brought up.' I asked, 'How do you

spend your time?" He answered, 'In songs of praise. But of this you will know more by and by; for where I am, you will surely be. I have lost much happiness by coming to you: and I should not have stayed so long without using other means to make you speak, but the Lord would not suffer me to fright you. Have you any thing more to say? It draws near two, and after that I cannot stay. I shall only come to you twice more before the death of my two children. God bless you.' Immediately I heard such singing, as if a thousand voices joined together. He then went down stairs, and I followed him to the first landing. He smiled, and I said, 'I desire you will come back.' He stood still till I came to him. I asked him one or two questions, which he immediately answered; but added, 'I wish you had not called me back, for now I must take something from you.' He paused a little, and said, 'I think you can best part with the hearing of your left ear.' He laid his hand upon it, and in the instant it was deaf as a stone; and it was several years before I recovered the least hearing of it. The cock crowed as he went out of the door, and then the music ceased. The eldest of his children died at about three years and a half, the younger before he was five years old. He appeared before the death of each, but without speaking: after that I saw him no more."

"12. A little before Michaelmas, 1763, my brother George, who was a good young man, went to sea. The day after Michaelmas-day, about midnight, I saw him standing by my bedside, surrounded with a glorious light, and looking earnestly at me. He was wet all over. That night the ship in which he sailed, split upon a rock and all the crew were drowned.

"13. On April 9, 1767, about midnight, I was lying awake, and I saw my brother John standing by my bedside. Just at that time he died in Jamaica.

"14. By his death I became entitled to a house in Sunderland, which was left us by my grandfather, John Hobson, an exceeding wicked man, who was drowned fourteen years ago. I employed an attorney to recover it from my aunts, who kept possession of it. But finding more difficulty than I expected, in the beginning of December I gave it up. Three or four nights after, as I rose from prayer, a little before eleven, I saw him standing at a small distance. I cried out, 'Lord bless me! what brings you here?' He answered, 'You have given up the house—Mr. Parker advised you so to do; but if you do, I shall have no rest: indeed, Mr. Dunn, whom you have hitherto

employed, will do nothing for you. Go to Durham, employ an attorney there, and it will be recovered.' His voice was loud, and so hollow and deep, that every word went through me. His lips did not move at all, nor his eyes, but the sound seemed to rise out of the floor. When he had done speaking, he turned about and walked out of the room.

"15. In January, as I was sitting on the bedside, a quarter before twelve, he came in, stood before me, looked earnestly at me, then walked up and down, and stood, and looked again. This he did for half an hour, and thus he came every other night for about three weeks. All this time he seemed angry, and sometimes his look was quite horrid and furious. One night I was sitting up in bed crying, when he came and began to pull off the clothes. I strove to touch his hand, but could not; on which he shrunk back and smiled.

"16. The next night but one, about twelve, I was again sitting up and crying, when he came and stood at the bedside. As I was looking for a handkerchief, he walked to the table, took one up, brought and dropped it upon the bed. After this, he came three or four nights and pulled the clothes off, throwing them on the other side of the bed.

"17. Two nights after, he came as I was sitting on the bedside, and, after walking to and fro, snatched the handkerchief from my neck. I fell into a swoon. When I came to myself, he was standing just before me. Presently he came close to me, dropped it on the bed, and went away.

"18. Having had a long illness the year before, having taken much cold by his frequent pulling off the clothes, and being worn out by these appearances, I was now mostly confined to my bed. The next night, soon after eleven, he came again; I asked, 'In God's name, why do you torment me thus? You know it is impossible for me to go to Durham now. But I have a fear that you are not happy, and beg to know whether you are or not.' He answered, after a little pause, 'That is a bold question for you to ask. So far as you knew me to do amiss in my lifetime, do you take care to do better.' I said, 'It is a shocking affair to live and die after that manner.' He replied, 'It is no time for reflections now: what is done cannot be undone.' I said, 'It must be a great happiness to live and die in the Lord!' He said, 'Hold your tongue! Hold your tongue! At your peril never mention such a word before me again!' I was frightened, and strove to lift up my heart to God. He gave a shriek, and sunk down at three times, with a loud groan at

each time. Just as he disappeared, there was a large flash of fire, and I fainted away.

"19. Three days after, I went to Durham, and put the affair in the hands of Mr. Hugill, the attorney. The next night, about one, he came in; but on my taking up the Bible, went away. A month after, he came about eleven. I said, 'Lord bless me! What has brought you here again?' He said, 'Mr. Hugill has done nothing but write one letter; you must write or go to Durham again. It may be decided in a few days.' I asked, 'Why do you not go to my aunts, who keep me out of it?' He answered, 'I have no power to go to them: and they cannot bear it. If I could, I would go to them, were it only to warn them; for, I doubt, where I am I shall get too many to bear me company.' He added, 'Take care—there is mischief laid in Peggy's hands—she will strive to meet you coming from your class. I do not speak to hinder you from going to it, but that you may be cautious. Let some one go with you, and come back with you; though whether you will escape or not, I cannot tell.' I said, 'She can do no more than God will let her.' He answered, 'We have all too little to do with him. Mention that word no more. As soon as this is decided, meet me at Boyldon Hill, between twelve and one at night.' I said, 'That is a lone place for a woman to go at that time of night. I am willing to meet you at the Ballast Hills, or in the church-yard.' He said, 'That will not do. But what are you afraid of?' I answered, 'I am not afraid of you, but of rude men.' He said, 'I will set you safe, both hither and back again.' I asked, 'May I not bring a minister with me?' He replied, 'Are you thereabouts? I will not be seen by any but you. You have plagued me sore enough already. If you bring any with you, take what follows.'

"20. From this time he appeared every night, between eleven and two. If I put out the fire and candle, in hopes I should not see him, it did not avail. For as soon as he came, all the room was light, but with a dismal light, like that of flaming brimstone. But whenever I took up the Bible, or kneeled down, yea, or prayed in my heart, he was gone.

"21. On Thursday, May 12, he came about eleven, as I was sitting by the fire. I asked, 'In God's name, what do you want?' He said, 'You must either go or write to Durham. I cannot stay from you till this is decided, and I cannot stay where I am.' When he went away, I fell into a violent passion of crying, seeing no end of my trouble. In this agony I con-

tinued till after one, and then fell into a fit. About two, I came to myself, and saw standing, at the bedside, one in a white robe, which reached down to his feet. I cried, 'In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—' He said, 'The Lord is with you, I am come to comfort you. What cause have you to complain and murmur thus? Why do you mourn thus for your friends? Pray for them, and leave them to God. Arise and pray.' I said, 'I can pray none.' He said, 'But God will help you; only keep close to God. You are backward likewise in praying with others, and afraid to receive the Lord's Supper. Break through that backwardness and that fear. The Lord bless you, and be ever with you!' As he went away, I heard many voices singing Hallelujah, with such melody as I never heard before. All my trouble was gone, and I wanted nothing but to fly away with them.

"22. Sat. 28.—About twelve, my grandfather stood at the bedside. I said, 'In God's name, what do you want?' He said, 'You do not make an end of this thing: get it decided as soon as possible. My coming is as uneasy to myself as it can be to you.' Before he came, there was a strong smell of burning, and the room was full of smoke, which got into my eyes, and almost blinded me for some time after.

"23. Wed. June 21.—About sunset I was coming up stairs, at Mrs. Knot's, and I saw him coming toward me out of the opposite room. He went close by me on the stair-head. Before I saw him, I smelt a strong smell of burning, and so did Miss Hosmer. It got into my throat, and almost stifled me. I sat down and fainted away.

"24. On Friday, July 3, I was sitting at dinner, when I thought I heard one come along the passage. I looked about, and saw my aunt, Margaret Scot, of Newcastle, standing at my back. On Saturday I had a letter, informing me that she died on that day."

"Thus far, Elizabeth Hobson.

"On Sunday, July 10, I received the following letter from a friend, to whom I had recommended her:—

"Sunderland, July 6, 1768.

"I wrote you word before, that Elizabeth Hobson was put into possession of the house. The same night her old visitant, who had not troubled her for some time, came again, and said, 'You must meet me at Boyldon Hill, on Thursday night, a little before twelve. You will see many appearances,'" (How strange

is this! Who can account for it?) “‘who will call you to come to them; but do not stir, neither give them any answer. At quarter after twelve, I shall come and call you; but still do not answer, nor stir.’ She said, ‘It is a hardship upon me for you to desire me to meet you there. Why cannot you take your leave now?’ He answered, ‘It is for your good that I desire it. I can take my leave of you now; but if I do, I must take something from you, which you would not like to part with.’ She said, ‘May not a few friends come with me?’ He said, ‘They may; but they must not be present when I come.’

“That night, twelve of us met at Mr. Davison’s,” (about a quarter of a mile from the hill,) “and spent some time in prayer. God was with us, of a truth. Then six of us went with her to the place, leaving the rest to pray for us. We came thither a little before twelve, and then stood at a small distance from her. It being a fine night, we kept her in our sight, and spent the time in prayer. She stood there till a few minutes after one. When we saw her move, we went to meet her. She said, ‘Thank God, it is all over and done. I found every thing as he told me. I saw many appearances, who called me to them; but I did not answer or stir. Then he came and called me at a distance, but I took no notice. Soon after, he came up to me, and said, ‘You are come well fortified.’ He then gave her the reasons why he required her to meet him at that place, and why he could take his leave there, and not in the house, without taking some thing from her. But withal he charged her to tell this to no one, adding, ‘If you disclose this to any creature, I shall be under a necessity of troubling you as long as you live. If you do not, I shall never trouble you, nor see you any more, either in time or eternity.’ He then bid her farewell, waved his hand, and disappeared.”

REMARKS.

The foregoing narrative of Elizabeth Hobson seems to indicate what Mr. Fowler would call a very large development of the organ of Spirituality; or it is a case of what is commonly called “second sight.” Mr. Fowler considers the existence of such an organ in the human head as a demonstration of the existence of a spiritual world; nor do we see how his conclusion can be evaded.

ARE THE SPIRITS OF DEPARTED SAINTS IN HEAVEN?

A SERMON.

“For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice, they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more. (For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart; and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.) But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels.”—Heb. xii. 18—22.

If man has a conscious spirit which survives the death of the body, as we have proved, it becomes a question of some interest, “*Where* are those spirits between death and the resurrection?” To notice all the theories extant on this subject, is no part of the object now before us; we shall, therefore, make our appeal to the Bible, and ask what is truth? The text under consideration speaks of the spirits of just men made perfect, and gives them a locality. Let us then consider:—

I. What is the heavenly Jerusalem?

II. In what sense the Christian church are come to it.

III. Who and what are its present occupants?

I. What is the heavenly Jerusalem?

The text says, it is the city of the living God—Mount Sion, the place where God dwells. We shall receive further light on this point from various texts of Scripture. Before the passion of our Saviour, he said to his disciples, John xiv., “In my Father’s house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” Wherever Christ has gone, therefore, is his Father’s house, or the city of God. But our text affirms that “Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant,” is in the heavenly Jerusalem; that place, therefore, is his Father’s house.

Again, his Father’s house is the place which he is preparing for his people, for their reception, when he shall come again. But the new Jerusalem, described in Rev. xxi., is promised to his saints; verse 27, “There shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.”

The new Jerusalem, therefore, is the city of God—the heavenly Jerusalem.

Once more: where God is, the angels dwell. Matth. xviii. 10. “For I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.” But there are, according to our text, an innumerable company of angels in the heavenly Jerusalem, where God’s presence is manifested. Heaven, therefore, is the heavenly Jerusalem, the new Jerusalem, the city of the living God, and Mount Sion. These various terms are all expressive of one and the same thing: the dwelling-place of God and locality of his throne. It is now in the heavens, but at the restitution will come down to earth and have its location here, when “God in very deed will dwell with men on the earth.” See Rev. xxi. and xxii. We next inquire:—

II. In what sense are the Christian church come to Mount Sion, &c.?

The epistle to the Hebrews is a book of parallels and contrasts. In our text the apostle contrasts the mediation of the old and new covenants. He first describes the mount and its scenery, where the old covenant was mediated by Moses. He calls attention to the mount, the scenery, and attending circumstances, where the new covenant is being mediated by Christ.

After the Hebrews left Egypt, they came to Sinai, where the old covenant was to be mediated and promulgated. After due preparation, the grand transaction was ushered in with solemn pomp and sublimity. Exodus xix. 16—25, and xx. 18—22. “And it came to pass on the third day, in the morning, that there were thunders, and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the Lord came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount; and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the mount, and Moses went up. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish. And let the priests also, which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them.

And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it. And the Lord said unto him, Away, get thee down, and thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee; but let not the priests and the people break through, to come up unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them. So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them." "And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking; and when the people saw it, they removed, and stood afar off. And they said unto Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die. And Moses said unto the people, Fear not, for God is come to prove you, and that his fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not. And the people stood afar off; and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was. And the Lord said unto Moses, Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven."

During the scene here described, the church were at the foot of the mount, while Moses went up into that mount as the mediator of the covenant of God with the children of Israel. That mount they could touch, but it was death for them, or even for a beast, to do so. Then follows

THE CONTRAST.—"For ye *are NOT come* to the mount that might be touched," &c. That is not the place, nor those the circumstances attendant on the mediation of the new covenant. True, it is being mediated. "But ye *are come* unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," &c.

The idea is this: The church has as truly come to the time and the mediation of the new covenant by Jesus Christ, as Israel at the foot of Sinai had to the mediation of the old covenant by Moses. Our Mediator is as truly and literally called up into the mount with God, as was Moses. We await, at the foot of the mount, the promulgation of the covenant, as truly as did the church in the wilderness. There were solemn injunctions laid on them in reference to their conduct during the absence of Moses, and mediation of the covenant, which it was death for them to disobey.

God then spake on earth, and gave through Moses those injunctions; he now speaks to us from heaven by his Son, and has made known our duty during the work of mediation.

"See that ye refuse not him that speaketh; for if they escaped

not who spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven. Whose voice then shook the earth; but now hath he promised, saying, I shake not the earth only, but also heaven."

With this view of the subject, we are not under the necessity, with Macknight, of changing the tense of the verb, from *are*, to *shall* come; nor yet to the absurdity, with others, of calling "Mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," the Christian church. Or, in other words, we are not reduced to the absurdity of informing the church she has come to herself.

Let us present the idea in its most simple form. As Israel waited at the base of Sinai, a mount which might be seen and touched, during the mediation of that covenant, and the absence of the mediator, so the Christian church waits at the foot of Mount Sion, a mount which is neither seen nor touched, during her Mediator's absence to mediate in that mount the new covenant. In this sense alone we understand the apostle to mean that we "*are come*" to that mount. We will consider,

III. Who and what are the present occupants of the heavenly Jerusalem?

This point has in part been anticipated; and we have learned, 1st, that God, the Judge of all, is there. This refers to God the Father, who is frequently presented in Scripture as Judge of the human race; while the Son, Jesus Christ, is represented as the executor of judgment. Dan. vii. 9, 10. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne the fiery flame, and his wheels burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set and the books were opened." Verse 13, "I saw in the night-visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him." In this text it is clear that by the Ancient of days is meant the Father. He sits in judgment; and the Son comes to him and receives authority to execute the judgment.

In like manner, the judgment is presented in Rev. xx. But the text itself is sufficiently pointed on the subject. It recognises the two persons: God the Judge of all, and Jesus the Mediator, &c.

2. "*An innumerable company of angels.*" The angelic host

are so frequently spoken of as having their residence in heaven, that we need scarcely dwell on the subject. A few texts will be sufficient. Matth. xviii. 10, has already been quoted. "In heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father," Luke xvi. 7, 10. "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." "Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."

Luke ii. 13, 15, "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host." "And it came to pass as the angels were gone away from them into heaven."

Luke i. 19, "And the angel answering, said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God."

These are ministering spirits who are sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation, and have their location before and round about the throne. Rev. vii. 11, "And all the angels stood round about the throne."

3. The general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven, are also in the heavenly Jerusalem. But who compose that assembly? This is a point on which it will be important to bestow some thought.

Christ is the first-born from the dead, Col. i. 18. If he is first-born from the dead, he is "the first-born among many brethren." Rom. viii. 29. It is the opinion of some that the general assembly and church of the first-born are the whole church of Christ. But the whole church cannot be the first-born; this is an insuperable objection to that view. To remove the difficulty it is said, the term "first born," applies to Christ, and that it is his church which is spoken of as the general assembly. To this we reply, the language of the original will not bear that construction. The apostle has not used the definite article *the*, as our translation indicates; and as he should have done, had he referred to Christ. But he leaves it quite indefinite: *πανεκκλησία πρωτοτοκων*, literally rendered, "*a general assembly and church of first-born.*" This confines the term *first-born* to the church; and, as before remarked, cannot mean the whole church, because the whole body cannot be first-born. The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable, that the "church of first-born," is a class of persons born from the dead with Christ, who is emphatically *the* first-born. But we have already learned from Rom. viii. 29, that he was to be "first-born *among* many brethren." Who were the many brethren among whom he was first-born? The apostle replies, "Whom he did foreknow,"

them he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." This transaction is related as being in the past, and it represents the subjects of it as being glorified; and they were predestinated to that privilege, that they might constitute the retinue of Christ, and that he might be the first-born among them. They were probably a select number of Jews, who, on account of God's foreknowledge of their holy lives, were predestinated to the privilege of being raised from the dead and glorified with our Saviour.

We next inquire for the history of the fact, and find it in the gospel as related in Matth. xxvii. 50—53. "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent, and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and appeared unto many."

In this event, Christ was the first to rise, and they "arose and came out of the graves after his resurrection." That they ever went back again into the grave, or died again, is not intimated. "MANY bodies of the saints which slept arose." That he might be the first-born among MANY brethren." The two accounts agree that *many* were designed, and *many* secured for that purpose.

"And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him a hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder; and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps. And they sung, as it were, a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts and the elders; and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God." Rev. xiv. 1—5.

Here the whole band appear on mount Sion, with the Lamb,

one hundred and forty-four thousand in number, the first fruits, redeemed from the earth. Can there be a doubt but that these were the saints raised after his resurrection? or that they constitute emphatically "a general assembly and church of first-born which are written in heaven?"

4. And Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, is also there. This has been sufficiently shown under the first head. It is a doctrine taught abundantly in the New Testament, and we pass to notice,

5. "The blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel."

The Jewish ceremonial was a pattern of things in the heavens. The apostle, in various points, shows how those ceremonies had their fulfilment in Christ's ministry. The blood of sprinkling, under the law, was carried once a year into the holy place to make an atonement. The law is thus expressed: Lev. xvi. 11—22, "And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, and shall kill the bullock of the sin-offering which is for himself. And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil. And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not. And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat, eastward; and before the mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times. Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat. And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel. And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about: and he

shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat; and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness."

"It was necessary," says the apostle Paul, Heb. ix. 23, "that the pattern of things in the heavens should be purified with such sacrifices; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." Again, "But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. ix. 11, 12.

We learn from the type that it is not till the atonement is made in the holy place, in the tabernacle of the congregation, and at the altar before the tabernacle, that it is completed. So Christ will do in heaven: 1st, present his blood and make atonement *for* and *in* the holy of holies. 2d. He will come out and offer the blood in the outer tabernacle; and 3d, he will appear to the whole congregation without that tabernacle, to finish the atonement. Then the great mystery of God will be finished, and there remain no more sacrifice for sin. "He that is unjust will be unjust still." Then the blood of sprinkling will be no more in the city of the living God; so that we are shut up to the faith, that the coming of the church here spoken of, to mount Sion, is before the coming of Christ, while yet the blood of sprinkling is there, not after the resurrection.

6. The spirits of just men made perfect are in that holy city. There is a sense in which they who have died in faith cannot be made perfect without us. Heb. xi. 40, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The perfection spoken of in this text embraces the perfection of the resurrection and enjoyment of the promised inheritance. This perfection, the whole body of Christ will receive at one and the same time, when Christ shall

appear. But there is a perfection of love, spoken of in the scriptures, which is to be attained in this world. Job attained it, and was a perfect man. Abraham was commanded to be perfect. Christ directed his disciples to be perfect, as their Father in heaven is perfect, &c. This moral perfection in this world is the necessary qualification for the enjoyment of the kingdom of heaven. The spirits of such persons according to our text are, after death, to the resurrection, in the heavenly Jerusalem.

It does not say to just men made perfect, that will only be at the resurrection, but "to the spirits of just men made perfect." At death, human probation ends, and the moral perfection of the just is finished, preparatory to the resurrection; they are then perfected spirits of the just, but at the resurrection will be perfected just men.

We have proved that the terms, "heaven," "heavenly Jerusalem," "city of God," "Mount Sion," "my Father's house," &c., are expressive of one place, the place where God the Father, Jesus Christ, an innumerable company of angels, the general assembly and church of the first-born, all dwell; and where the blood of sprinkling is presented. In this holy city, also, are the spirits of the just. The allegation that the scene is future, and refers to the resurrection state, cannot be harmonized with the fact that these are spirits of just men; those will be just men themselves.

Does this agree with other scriptural accounts of their condition and place?

It does. 1. It agrees with John, Rev. iv., v., vi., who, in a trance and view of heaven, saw there the souls of the martyrs.

2. It agrees with Paul's view, Philip. i. 21—24, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

3. It is in harmony with Christ's promise to the thief on the cross, "This day shalt thou be with me in the paradise."

4. It is in accordance with the vision and prayer of Stephen, Acts vii. 55, 56, 59, "But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. . . . And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."

There are various other scriptures which are in perfect harmony with the foregoing, but these are sufficient for our purpose. They teach us most clearly that the spirits of the saints are in the new Jerusalem; and "those that sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him."

Objection. "The Psalmist says, Ps. xvi. 11, 'In thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.' If the saints at death go into his presence, they have fulness of joy, and there is no need of a resurrection to consummate their happiness, for they can have no more than a fulness."

Answer. It does not follow because there is a fulness of joy in God's presence, that all will possess and enjoy it. There must be a qualification for enjoyment before it can be possessed. 2 Chron. xviii. 20, 21, "Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail; go out, and do even so." Because this lying spirit stood before the Lord, does it follow that he had fulness of joy? On another occasion the sons of God were met together, and Satan came also among them, Job i. 6. Must Satan necessarily have fulness of joy because he was in God's presence? There must, we repeat, be a moral qualification for enjoyment before it can be possessed. A disembodied spirit may be happy, and yet not have that capacity for enjoyment which it will have when perfected in the resurrection. Those who have any religious experience know that, in places of worship, while all around have been exceedingly happy, that from some cause in their condition they have sometimes been very unhappy.

The text quoted refers to the resurrection state for the fulness of joy, and not to the disembodied state.

But the scriptures represent the condition of the righteous dead as being, not a state of reward and joy, but as a state of rest and comfort, better than to remain in the body. Isa. lvii. 2, "He shall enter into peace: they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness." Luke xvi. 25, "But now he is comforted." This was said of Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. Rev. xiv. 13, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord; Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

But even St. Paul did not look for his crown till "that day."

That the righteous cannot receive their promised reward till the resurrection and restitution, is manifest from the nature of that reward. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," *Matth. v. 5*. An inheritance on earth requires a resurrection and possession of a physical body in order to its possession and enjoyment.

The promises of God to the old patriarchs, that both they and their seed should have an everlasting inheritance in the land of Canaan, implies a resurrection from the dead, for, as disembodied spirits, they cannot enjoy such a possession. *Genesis xviii. 8*.

The promise made to the whole house of Israel, *Ezek. xxxvii.*, that they shall be gathered from all countries to the land of Israel, is predicated upon their resurrection from the dead. "I will open your graves, O my people, and bring you up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." "And they shall dwell in the land I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children, for ever." This promise is made to the pious Jews of all ages; and in order for it to be fulfilled, they must have a resurrection and a body adapted to the enjoyment of such an inheritance.

The entire objection, therefore, "If departed saints go to heaven at death, there is no need of a resurrection," falls to the ground. For, although it is better to depart and be with Christ than to remain in the flesh, it by no means follows that the saint will not infinitely prefer to be clothed upon with an incorruptible body; for without that body they can never receive their promised inheritance. No wonder, then, that St. Paul so earnestly desired a resurrection from the body. *Phil. iii. 11*.

The existence of the spirits of just men made perfect in the heavenly Jerusalem is, therefore, another invulnerable evidence of conscious existence after death, and is a pledge of a part in the kingdom of God.

DEMONOLOGY.

In a former number, in referring to the subject of demons, we proposed, at a future time, to discuss the subject of their character; and to inquire into their human origin. By the kindness of Dr. J. T. Walsh, we have been furnished with a copy of Alexander Campbell's Address on Demonology. The subject is so fully and ably discussed by him, that we give it in preference to attempting an original argument. We consider it fully demonstrated that the demons of the New Testament were spirits of deceased human beings. The argument is this: The Greek poets and philosophers of antiquity, with whom the term "demon" originated, the Romans and Jews of the age of Christ, and the Christian fathers who followed the apostles, have each testified that their understanding, and the common understanding and belief of their respective ages, was, that demons were the spirits of the dead.

Christ and his apostles have used the term seventy-five times in the New Testament, without defining it; and, hence, must have used it in its common acceptance, as being departed spirits.

We commend the argument to the prayerful consideration of all who are interested in the subject of a future existence. True, there might be much more said, and a great variety of ancient testimonies produced, which are here omitted; but these are sufficient to establish the premises. We omit Mr. Campbell's introductory remarks, as not being essential to his argument.—ED.

DEMONOLOGY.—*An address delivered to the Popular Lecture Club, Nashville, Tennessee, March 10, 1841.*—BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

That a class of beings of some sort, designated *demons*, has been an element of the faith, an object of the dread and veneration of all ages and nations, as far back as all memory reaches, no one who believes in a spiritual system—no one who regards the volumes of divine inspiration, or who is only partially acquainted with Pagan and Jewish antiquity can reasonably doubt. But concerning these demons, of what order of intelligences, of what character and destiny, of what powers intellectual and moral, or immoral, there has been much debate, and still there is need of farther and more satisfactory examination.

Before entering either philosophically or practically into this investigation, it is necessary that we define the true and proper meaning of the term *demon*. This word, it is said, is of Grecian origin and character—of which, however, we have not full assurance. In that language it is written and pronounced *daimoon*; and, according to some etymologists, is legitimately descended from a very ancient verb pronounced *daioo*, which means *to discriminate, to know*. *Daimoon*, or *demon*, therefore, simply indicates a person of intelligence—a *knowing one*. Thus, before the age of philosophy, or the invention of the name, those were called demons, as a title of honour, who afterwards as-

sumed the more modest title of philosophers. Aristotle, for his great learning, was called *demon*, as was the celebrated Thucydides; hence, among the Platonists it was for some time a title of honour. But this, it must be observed, was a special appropriation, like our use of the words *divine* and *reverend*. When we apply these titles to sinful men, who, because of their calling, ought to be not only intelligent, but of a divine and celestial temper and morality, we use them by a special indulgence from that sovereign pontiff with whom is the *jus et norma loquendi*.

But as some of the Platonists elevated the spirits of departed heroes, public benefactors, and distinguished men, into a species of demi-gods or mediators between them and the Supreme Divinity, as some of our forefathers were accustomed to regard the souls of departed saints, this term began to be used in a more general sense. Among some philosophers it became the title of an object of worship; while, on the other hand, it degenerated into the genii of poetry and imagination.

In tracing the popular transitions and transmigrations of words, permit me, gentlemen, to say that we are not to imagine that they very ceremoniously advance, as our naval and military officers, from one rank to another, by some systematic or conventional agreement, amongst the heads of the departments in the army of words and phalanxes of human speech. On the contrary, the transitions are exceedingly anomalous, and sometimes inverted. In this instance, the term *demon*, from simply indicating *a knowing one*, became the title of a human spirit when divested of the appendages of its clay tenement, because of its supposed initiation into the secrets of another world. Thus a separated spirit became a genius, a demi-god, a mediator, a divinity of the ancient superstition according to its acquirements in this state of probation.

But we shall better understand the force and import of this mysterious word from its earliest acceptation among the elder Pagans, Jews, and Christians, than from the speculations of etymologists and lexicographers. Historical facts, then, and not etymological speculations, shall decide not only its meaning, but the character and rank of those beings on whom, by common consent, this significant title was conferred.

To whom, then, among Pagan writers shall we make our first appeal? Shall we not at once carry up the question to the most venerable Hesiod, the oldest of Grecian bards, whose antique style even antedates that of Homer himself almost one

hundred years? Shall we not appeal to the genealogist of all the gods, the great theogonist of Grecian mythology? Who than he more likely to be acquainted with the ancient traditions of demons? And what is the sum of his testimony in the case? Hear him speak in the words of Plutarch:—"The spirits of mortals become demons when separated from their earthly bodies." The Grecian biographist not only quotes with approbation the views of Hesiod, but corroborates them with the result of his own researches, avowing his conviction that "the demons of the Greeks were the ghosts and genii of departed men; and that they go up and down the earth as observers, and even rewarders of men; and although not actors themselves, they encourage others to act in harmony with their views and characters." Zenocrates, too, as found in Aristotle, extends the term to the souls of men before death, and calls them demons while in the body. To the good demons and the spirits of deceased heroes they allotted the office of mediators between gods and men.* In this character Zoroaster, Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, Plutarch, Celsus, Apuleius, and many others, contemplated the demons of their times.

Whoever, indeed, will be at pains to examine the Pagan mythologies, one and all, will discover that some doctrine of demons, as respects their nature, abodes, characters, or employments, is the ultimate foundation of the whole superstructure; and that the radical idea of all the dogmata of their priests, and the fancies and fables of their poets, are found in that most ancient and veritable tradition—that the spirits of men survive their fallen tabernacles, and live in a disembodied state from death to the dissolution of material nature. To these spirits in the character of genii, gods, or demi-gods, they assigned the fates and fortunes of men and countries. With them a hero on earth became a demon in hades; and a demi-god, a numen, a divinity in the skies. It is not without some reason that the witty and ingenious Lucian makes his dialogist, in the orthodoxy of his age, thus ask and answer the following questions; *What is man? A mortal god! And what is God? An immortal man!* In one sentence, all Pagan antiquity affirms that from Titan and Saturn, the poetic progeny of Cœlus and Terra, down to Æsculapius, Proteus, and Minos, all their divinities were the ghosts of dead men, and were so regarded by the most erudite of the Pagans themselves.

* Hence the saint worship and saint mediators of the dark ages, and of the less favoured portions of our Anglo-Saxon race.

Think not, gentlemen, that because we summon the Pagan witnesses first, that we regard them either as the first in point of age or character. Far from it. They were a pack of plagiarists, from Hesiod to Lucian. The Greeks were the greatest literary thieves and robbers that ever lived, and they had the most consummate art of concealing the theft. From these Pagans, whether Greeks or Romans, we ascend to the Jews and to the Patriarchs, whose annals transcend those of the most ancient Pagans many centuries.

In the times of the Patriarchs, in the infancy of the Abrahamic family, long before the time of their own Moses, we learn that in the land of Canaan, almost coeval with the promise of it to Abraham, demons were recognised and worshipped. The consultation of the spirits of the dead, the art and mystery of necromancy, the species of familiar spirits and wizards, are older than Moses, and spoken of by him as matters of ancient faith and veneration. Statutes, indeed, are ordained, and laws are promulgated from Mount Sinai in Arabia, from the voice of the Eternal King, against the worship of demons, the consultation of familiar spirits, the practice of necromancy, and all the arts of divination, of which we may speak more particularly in the sequel. Hence we affirm that the doctrine of a separate state—of disembodied ghosts, or demons—of necromancy and divination, is a thousand years older than Homer or Hesiod, than any Pagan historian, philosopher, or poet whatsoever. And so deeply rooted in the land of Canaan, so early and so long cherished and taught by the seven nations was this doctrine in all its branches, that, notwithstanding the severe statutes against it, traces of it are found among the Jews for almost a thousand years after Moses.* Of the wicked Jeroboam it is said, "He ordained priests for the high places, and for the demons."† Even David admits that his nation "learned the works of the heathen, served their idols, and sacrificed their sons and daughters to demons;" and he adds, "they ate the sacrifices of the dead;" a clear intimation that worshipping demons was worshipping the dead. Isaiah, too, lamenting their idolatry, asks the mortifying question, "Shall a people seek for the living to the dead?"

But there is a peculiarity in the acceptation of this term among Jews and Pagans which demands special attention. Amongst them the term *demon* generally, if not universally, de-

* Deuteronomy xviii. 10. Leviticus xvii. 7, &c.

† 2 Chron. xi. 15. Psalm cvi. 37.

noted an unclean, malign, or wicked spirit: whereas, amongst the Pagans it as often represented a good as an evil spirit. Who has not heard of the good demon of Socrates, and of the evil genius of Brutus? While among Jews and Christians so commonly are found the *akatharta pneumata*, or the *ponera pneumata*—the unclean and malign spirits, that our translators have almost uniformly translated them *devils*.

In the Christian scriptures we meet the term *demon*, in one form or other, seventy-five times, and in such circumstances, as, with one or two exceptions, constrain us to regard it as the representative of a wicked and unclean spirit. So general is this fact, that Beelzebub is dignified "*The Prince of the Demons*," unfortunately rendered *devils*. This frequency of immoral and wicked associations with the word *daimoon* may have induced our translators to give us so many *devils* in their authorized version. But this misapprehension is now universally admitted and regretted; for while the Bible teaches many demons, it nowhere intimates a plurality of Devils or Satans. There is but one Devil or Satan in the universe, whose legions of angels and demons give him a sort of omnipresence, by acting out his will in all their intercourse with mortals. This evil spirit, whose official titles are the Serpent, the Devil, and Satan, is always found in the singular number in both the Hebrew and Greek scriptures; while *demon* is found in both numbers, indicating sometimes one, and sometimes a legion.

But that we may not be farther tedious in this dry work of definition, and that we may enter at once upon the subject with a zeal and spirit worthy of a topic which lays the axe at the root of the tree of modern Sadduceeism, Materialism, and Skepticism, we shall proceed at once to sum up the evidence in proof of the proposition which we shall state as the peculiar theme of this great literary adventure. That proposition is—*The demons of Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity were the ghosts of dead men.*

But some of you may say, You have proposed to dismiss this work of definition too soon, for here is the horrible word *ghost*! Of what is that term the sign in your style? Well, we must explain ourselves.

Our Saxon forefathers, of whom we have no good reason to be ashamed, were wont to call the spirits of men, especially when separated from their bodies, *ghosts*. This, however, they did not with the terrible associations which arise in our minds on every pronunciation of that startling term. *Guest* and *ghost*,

with them, if not synonymes, were, at least, cousins-german. They regarded the body as the *house*, and therefore called the spirit the *guest*; for guest and ghost are two branches from the same root. William Tyndale, the martyr, of excellent memory, in his version of the New Testament, the prototype of that of King James, very judiciously makes the Holy Spirit of the Old Testament the Holy Ghost of the New; because, in his judgment, it was the promised guest of the Christian temple.

Still it is difficult, I own, to hear the word ghost, or demon, without the recollection of the nursery tales and fictions of our irrational systems of early education. We suffer little children to hear so much of

“Apparitions tall and ghastly,
That take their stand o’er some new-opened grave,
And, strange to tell, evanish at the crowing of the cock,”

till they become not only in youth, but often in riper years, the prey and sport of idle fears and terrors, “which scarce the firm philosopher can scorn.” Not only the graveyard,

“But the lonely tower
Is also shunned, whose mournful chronicles hold,
So night-struck fancy dreams, the yelling ghost!”

Imagination once startled,

“In grim array the nightly spectres rise!
Oft have we seen the school-boy, with satchel in his hand,
When passing by some haunted spot, at lonely ev’n,
Whistling aloud to bear his courage up. Suddenly he hears,
Or thinks he hears, the sound of something purring at his heels;
Full fast he flies, nor does he look behind him,
Till out of breath he o’ertake his fellows,
Who gather round and wonder at the tale!”

Parents are greatly at fault for permitting such tales to disturb the fancies of their infant offspring. The love of the marvellous and of the supernatural is so deeply planted in human nature, that it needs but little cultivation to make it fruitful in all manner of fairy tales, of ghosts and spectres. But there is an opposite extreme—the denial of spirits, angels, demons, whether good or bad. Here, too, *media ibis tutissima*—the middle path the safer is. But, to our proposition. We have, from a careful survey of the history of the term *demon*, concluded that *the demons of Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity were the ghosts of dead men*. But we build not only upon the definition of the term, nor on its philological history, but upon the following seven pillars:—

1. All the Pagan authors of note, whose works have survived the wreck of ages, affirm the opinion that demons were the spirits or ghosts of dead men. From Hesiod down to the more polished Celsus, their historians, poets, and philosophers occasionally express this opinion.

2. The Jewish historians, Josephus and Philo, also avow this conviction. Josephus says, "Demons are the spirits of wicked men, who enter into living men and destroy them, unless they are so happy as to meet with speedy relief."* Philo says, "The souls of dead men are called demons."

3. The Christian fathers, Justin Martyr, Iræneus, Origen, &c. depose to the same effect. Justin, when arguing for a future state, alleges, "Those who are seized and tormented by the souls of the dead, whom all call demons, and madmen."† Lardner, after examining with the most laborious care the works of these, and all the Fathers of the first two centuries, says, "The notion of demons, or the souls of dead men, having power over living men, was *universally* prevalent among the heathen of these times, and believed by many Christians."‡

4. The Evangelists and Apostles of Jesus Christ so understood the matter. As this is a very important, and of itself a sufficient pillar on which to rest our edifice, we shall be at more pains to illustrate and enforce it. We shall first state the philological law or canon of criticism, on the generality and truth of which all our dictionaries, grammars, and translations are formed. Every word not specially explained or defined in a particular sense, by any standard writer of any particular age and country, is to be taken and applied in the current or commonly received signification of that country and age in which the writer lived and wrote. If this canon of translation and of criticism be denied, then we affirm there is no value in dictionaries, nor in the acquisition of ancient languages in which any book may be written; nor is there any confidence in any translation of any ancient work, sacred or profane: for they are all made upon the assumption of the truth of this law.

We have, then, only to ask first for the current signification of this term *demon* in Judea at the Christian era; and, in the second place, Did the inspired writers ever give any special definition of it? We have already found an answer to the first in the Greeks and Jews of the apostolic age—also, in the preceding

* De Bello Jud. cap. viii. 25; cap. vi. sect. 3.

† Jus. Apology, b. i. p. 65, par. 12, p. 54.

‡ Vol. viii. p. 363.

and subsequent age. We have heard Josephus, Philo, Lucian, Justin, and Lardner, from whose writings and affirmations we are expressly told what the universal acceptation of the term was in Judea and in those times; and, in the second place, the Apostles and our Lord, as already said, use this word in various forms seventy-five times, and on no occasion give any hint of a special, private, or peculiar interpretation of it; which was not their method when they used a term either not generally understood, or understood in a special sense. Does any one ask the meaning of the word Messiah, prophet, priest, elder, deacon, presbytery, altar, sacrifice, Sabbath, circumcision, &c., &c.? We refer him to the current signification of these words among the Jews and Greeks of that age. Why then should any one except the term *demon* from the universal law? Are we not, therefore, sustained by the highest and most authoritative decision of that literary tribunal by whose rules and decrees all works sacred and profane are translated from a dead to a living tongue? We are, then, fully authorized to say that the demons of the New Testament were the spirits of dead men.

5. But distinct evidence of the historic kind, and rather as confirmatory of our views than of the authority of the inspired authors, I adduce as a separate and independent witness a very explicit and decisive passage from the epistle to the Smyrneans, written by the celebrated Ignatius, the disciple of the Apostle John. He quotes the words of the Lord to Peter when Peter supposed he saw a spirit or a ghost. But he quotes him thus, "Handle me and see, for I am not a *daimoon asomaton*—a disembodied demon;"—a spirit without a body. This places the matter above all doubt, that with them of that day a demon and a ghost were equivalent terms.

6. But we also deduce an argument from the word *angel*. This word is of Bible origin, and confined to those countries in which that volume is found. It is not found in all the Greek poets, orators, or historians, so far as known to me. Of that rank of beings to whom Jews and Christians have applied this official title, the Pagan nations seem never to have had the first conception. It is, therefore, certain that they could not use the term *demon* as a substitute interchangeable with the word *angel*—as indicative of an intermediate order of intelligent beings above men, and between them and the Divinity. They had neither the name nor the idea of an angel in their mythology. Philo the Jew has, indeed, said that amongst the Jews the word *demon* and the word *angel* were sometimes used interchangea-

bly; and some have thence inferred lapsed angels were called demons. But this is not a logical inference: for the Jews called the winds, the pestilence, the lightnings of heaven, &c., *angels*, as indicative of their agency in accomplishing the will of God. In this sense, indeed, a demon might be officially called an angel. But in this sense, demon is to angel as the species to the genus: we can call a demon an angel, but we cannot call an angel a demon—just as we can call every man an animal, but we cannot call every animal a man.

Others, indeed, have just as fancifully imagined that the old *giants* and *heroes*, said to have been the fruit of the intermarriage of the sons of God with the daughters of men before the flood, were the demons of all the world—Pagans, Jews, and Christians. Their most plausible argument is, that the word *heros* and the word *love* are the same; and that the *loves* of the angels for the daughters of men, was the reason that their gigantic offspring were called *heroes*. Whence the term was afterwards appropriated to persons of great courage as well as of great stature. This is sublimely ridiculous.

But to return to the word *angel*. It is a Bible term, and not being found in all classic, in all mythologic antiquity, could not enter into the Pagan ideas of a demon. Now, that it is not so used in the Christian scriptures, is evident for the following reasons:—

1st. Angels were never said to enter into any one.

2d. Angels have no affection for bodies of any sort, either as habitations or vehicles of action.

3d. Angels have no predilection for tombs and monuments of the dead.

In these three particulars angels and demons stand in full contrast, and are contradistinguished by essentially different characteristics: for—

1st. Demons have entered into human bodies and into the bodies of inferior creatures.

2d. Demons evince a peculiar affection for human bodies, and seem to desire them both as vehicles of action and as places of habitation.

3d. Demons also evince a peculiar fondness for their old mortal tenements; hence, we so often read of them carrying the possessed into the grave-yards, the tombs, and sepulchres, where, perchance, their old mortalities lay in ruins.

From which facts we argue, as well as from the fact that the Pagans had neither Devil, nor angel, nor Satan, in their heads,

before the Christian times; that when they, or the Christians, or the Jews spoke of *demons*, they could not mean any intermediate rank of spirits, other than the spirits of dead men. Hence, in no instance in holy writ can we find *demon* and *angel* used as convertible terms. Is it not certain, then, that they are the ghosts of dead men? But there yet remains another pillar:—

7. Among the evidences of the papal defection intimated by Paul, he associates the *doctrine concerning demons* with celibacy and abstinence from certain meats, as chief among the signs of that fearful apostacy. He warrants the conclusion that the purgatorial prisons for ghosts and the ghostly mediators of departed saints, which, equally with commanding to abstain from lawful meats, and forbidding to marry, characterize the times of which he spoke, are attributes of the same system, and indicative of the fact that *demons* and *ghosts* are two names of the same beings. To this we add the testimony of James, who says *the demons believe and tremble* for their doom. Now, all eminent critics concur that the spirits of wicked men are here intended; and need I add that oft-repeated affirmation of the demoniacs, “We know thee, Jesus of Nazareth; art thou come to torment us before the time?” Thus all the scriptural allusions to this subject authorize the conclusion that demons are ghosts, and especially wicked and unclean spirits of dead men. A single saying in the Apocalypse makes this most obvious. When Babylon is razed to its foundation, it is said to be made the habitation of demons—of the ghosts of its sepulchred inhabitants. From these seven sources of evidence, namely: the Pagan authors, the Jewish historians, the Christian fathers, the four Evangelists, the epistle of Ignatius, the acceptance of the term *angel* in its contrast with *demon*, and the internal evidences of the whole New Testament, we conclude that the demons of the New Testament were the ghosts of wicked men. May we not henceforth reason from this point with all assurance as a fixed and fundamental principle?

It ought, however, to be candidly stated that there have been in latter times a few intellectual dyspeptics, on whose nervous system the idea of being really possessed by an evil spirit, produces a phrensied excitement. Terrified at the thought of an incarnate demon, they have resolutely undertaken to prove that every single demon named in holy writ is but a bold eastern metaphor, placing in high relief dumbness, deafness, madness, palsy, epilepsy, &c.; and hence *démoniacs* then and now are a class of unfortunates labouring under certain physical maladies called unclean spirits. *Credat Judæus Appella, non Ego.*

On the principle that every demon is an eastern metaphor, how incomparably more eloquent than Demosthenes or Cicero, was he that had at one time a legion of eastern metaphors within him struggling for utterance! No wonder, then, that the swine herds of Gadara were overwhelmed by the moving eloquence of their herds as they rushed with such pathos into the deep waters of the dark Galilee!

Great men are not always wise. The seer of Mesopotamia was not only admonished, but reformed by the eloquence of an ass; and I am sure that the Gadarene speculators were cured of their belief in eastern metaphors when they saw their hopes of gain for ever buried in the lake of Gennesereth. It requires a degree of gravity bordering on the superlative, to speculate on a hypothesis so singularly fanciful and baseless as that which converts both reason and eloquence, deafness and dumbness, into one and the same metaphor.

Without impairing in the least the strength of the arguments in favour of actual possession by the spirits of dead men, it may be conceded that, because of the similarity of some of the effects of demoniacal possession with those maladies of the paralytic and epileptic character, it may have happened on some occasions that persons simply afflicted with these diseases, because of the difficulties of always discriminating the remote causes of these maladies, were, by the common people, regarded as demoniacs, and so reported in the New Testament. Still the fact that the Great Teacher himself distinguishes between demons and all human maladies, in commanding the Apostles not only to "heal all manner of diseases, to cleanse the lepers, and raise the dead," but also to "cast out demons;" and the fact still more palpable, that in number and power these demons are represented as transcending all physical maladies, precludes the possibility of contemplating them as corporeal diseases.

"When I read of the number of demons in particular persons," says a very distinguished Bible critic, "and see their actions expressly distinguished from those of the man possessed; conversations held by the demons about their disposal after their expulsion; and accounts given how they were actually disposed of; when I find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them; and similitudes taken from their manners and customs, it is impossible for me to deny their existence, without admitting that the sacred historians were themselves deceived in regard to them, or intended to deceive their readers."

Were it not in appearance like killing those that are dead, I

should quote at length sundry passages which speak of "unclean spirits *crying with loud voices*" as they came out of many that were possessed, which represent unclean spirits falling down before Jesus, and crying, "Thou art the Son of God," and of Jesus "charging them not to make him known;" but I will only cite a single parable framed upon the case of a demoniac. It is reported by Matthew and Luke, and almost in the same words. "When the unclean spirit," says Jesus, "is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest and finding none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then he goeth and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also to this wicked generation." On which observe, that "unclean spirits" is another name for demon—that is, a metaphor of a metaphor; for if demons are metaphors for diseases, the unclean spirits are metaphors of metaphors, or shadows of shades. Again, the Great Teacher is found not only for once departing from himself, but also from all human teachers of renown, in basing a parable upon a parable, or a shadow upon a shade, in drawing a similitude from a simile. His object was to illustrate the last state of the Jews. This he attempts by the adventures of a demon—first being dispossessed, finding no rest, and returning with others more wicked than himself to the man from whom he was driven. Now if this was all a figure to illustrate a figure, the Saviour has done that which he never before attempted, inasmuch as his parables are all founded not upon fiction, but upon facts—upon the actual manners and customs, the incidents and usages of society.

That must be a desperate position to sustain which degrades the Saviour as a teacher below the rank of the most ordinary instructors of any age. The last state of the Jews compared to a metaphor!—compared to a nonentity!—compared to a fiction! This is even worse than representing a trope coming out of a man's mouth, "crying with a loud voice," "wandering through dry places,"—unfigurative language, I presume—seeking a period, and finding a comma. At length, tired and fatigued, returning with seven fiercer metaphors more wickedly eloquent than himself, re-possessing the orator, and making him internally more eloquent than before. It will not help the matter to say that when a disease leaves a man, it wanders

through dry or wet places—through marshes and fens—through deserts and prairies—and finding no rest for its foot, takes with him seven other more violent diseases, and seeks for the unfortunate man from whom the doctors expelled it, and, re-entering his improved constitution, makes that his eternal abode.

In one sentence, then, we conclude that there is neither reason nor fact—there is no canon of criticism, no law of interpretation—there is nothing in human experience or observation—there is nothing in all antiquity, sacred or profane, that, in our judgment, weighs against the evidence already adduced in support of the position, that *the demons of Pagans, Jews, and Christians were the ghosts of dead men; and, as such, have taken possession of men's living bodies, and have moved, influenced, and impelled them to certain courses of action.*

Permit me, gentlemen, to demonstrate that this is no abstract and idle speculation, by stating a few of the practical aspects and bearings of this doctrine of demonology:—

1st. It relieves the Bible from the imputation of promulging laws against non-entities in all its legislation against necromancers, diviners, soothsayers, wizards, fortune-tellers, &c. When Jehovah gave this law to Israel, he legislated not against mere pretences saying, “You shall not permit to live among you any one that useth divination, an enchanter, a witch, a consulter of familiar spirits, a wizard, or a necromancer; for all that do these things are an abomination to the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive these nations out before thee.” A divine law demanding capital punishment because of a mere pretence! The most incredible thing in the world! The existence of such a statute, as before intimated, implies not merely the antiquity of the fact of demoniacal influence, but supposes it so palpable that it could be proved by at least two witnesses, and so satisfactorily as to authorize the taking away of human life without the risk of shedding innocent blood.

That there have been pretenders to such mysterious arts, impostors and hypocrites in necromancy, witchcraft, and divination, as well as in every thing else, I doubt not; but if the pretence to work a miracle, or to utter a prediction, be a proof that there were true miracles and true prophets, the pretence of necromancy, witchcraft, and divination, is also a proof that there were once true necromancers, wizards, and diviners. The fame of the Egyptian Jannes and Jambres who withstood Moses in the presence of Pharaoh—the fame of the woman of En-

dor, who invoked Samuel, or some one that personated him—and of the Pythonic damsel that followed Paul and Barnabas, and who enriched her master by her divination, stand on the pages of eternal truth, imperishable monuments, not merely of the antiquity of the pretence, but of the reality of demoniacal power and possession.

May I be permitted farther to observe on this mysterious subject, that necromancy was the principal parent of all the arts of divination ever practised in the world, and was directly and avowedly founded on the fact, not only of demoniacal influence, but that demons are the spirits of dead men, with whom living men could, and did, form intimacies. This the very word *necromancy* intimates. The necromancer predicted the future by means of demoniacal inspiration. He was a prophet inspired by the dead. His art lay in making or finding a familiar spirit, in evoking a demon from whom he obtained superhuman knowledge. So the Greek term imports and all antiquity confirms.

There are two subjects on which God is silent, and man most solicitous to know—the world of spirits, and his own future destiny. On these two subjects ghosts who have visited the unseen world, and whose horizon is so much enlarged, are supposed to be peculiarly intelligent, and on this account originally called *demons*, or *knowing ones*. But this knowledge being forbidden, kindly forbidden man, to seek it at all, and especially by unlawful means, has always been obnoxious to the anathema of Heaven. Hence the popularity of the profession of evoking familiar spirits, and hence also the indignation of Heaven against those who consulted them.

Still we will be asked, Has any spirit of man, dead or alive, power to foresee and foretell the future? Does any one know the future but God? To which we cheerfully respond, The living and inspired prophets only knew a part of the future. God alone knows all the future. But angels or demons may know much more of it than man. How this may be, analogy itself may suggest. Suppose, for example, that one man possessed the discriminating powers of a Bacon, a Newton, or a Locke, only of a more capacious and retentive memory, had been coeval with Cain, Noah, or Abraham, and with a deathless vigour of constitution, had lived with all the generations of men since their day till now, an inductive philosopher, of course; what would be his comparative power of calculating chances and contingencies—the laws of cause and effect—and of thence

anticipating the future? Still, compared with one who had passed that mysterious bourne of time, he would be the infant of a day, knowing comparatively nothing of human destiny. But, indeed, the powers of knowing, peculiar to disembodied spirits, are to us as inscrutable as the very elements of their spiritual forms and existence. But that they do know more of a spiritual system and more of human destiny than we, all antiquity sacred and profane fully reveals and confirms.

2. But a second practical aspect of this theory of demons demands our attention. *It is a palpable and irrefragable proof of a spiritual system.*

The gross materialists of the French school, when Atheism triumphed over reason and faith, proclaimed from their own metropolis, and had it cut deep in marble too, that death was an eternal sleep of body, soul and spirit, in one common unconsciousness of being. Since that time we have had the subject somewhat refined and sublimated into an intermediate sleep of only some six or seven thousand years, between our earthly exit and the resurrection morn. These more speculative materialists convert demons into metaphors, lapsed angels, or devils—into any thing rather than the living spirits of dead men.

They see that our premises being admitted, there must be a renunciation not only of the grosser, but of the more ethereal, forms of materialism of those who lull the spirit to repose with its kindred mortality, in their opposition to the inhabitation of the human body by any other spirit than its own. They make but little argumentative gain who assume that demons are lapsed angels rather than human ghosts; for who will not admit that it may be more easy for a demon than an angel who has a spiritual body of his own, to work by the machinery of a human body, and to excite the human passions to any favourite course of action! Were this not the fact, they must have tenanted the human body to little purpose, if a perfect stranger to all its rooms and doors could, on its first introduction, move through them as easily as they.

“If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?”

To allegorize demoniacal influences, or to metamorphose them into rhetorical imagery, is the shortest, though the most desperate escape, from all spiritual embarrassment in the case. But the harder you press the skeptical philosopher on the subject of his peculiar idolatry, the more bold his denial of all spiritual influences, celestial or infernal; and the more violently he af-

firms that demoniacal possessions were physical diseases; that necromancy, familiar spirits, and divination, though older than Moses, and the seven nations of Canaan, were but mere pretences; an imposition on the credulity of man, as idle as the legends of Salem witchcraft, or the fairy tales of the mother-land of sprites and apparitions. But this, let me tell you, skeptical philosopher, relieves not the hard destiny of your case. Whether necromancy in all its forms was real or pretended, true or false, affects not the real merits of the question before us.

To me, in this branch of the argument, it is perfectly indifferent whether it was a pretence or a reality; for, mark it well, had there not been a senior and more venerated belief in the existence of a spiritual system—a general persuasion that the spirits of the dead lived in another world while their bodies lay in this, and that disembodied spirits were demons or knowing ones on these peculiar points so interesting and so unapproachable to man; who ever could have thought of consulting them, of evoking them by any art, or of pretending in the face of the world to any familiarity with them? I gain strength by the denial or by the admission of the thing so long as its high antiquity must be conceded. I do indeed contend, and will contend, that a belief in demons, in a separate existence of the spirits of the dead, is more ancient than necromancy, and that it is a belief and a tradition older than the Pagan, the Jewish, or the Christian systems—older than Moses and his law—older than any earthly record whatever.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

DEMONSTRATED BY FACTS.

“The dead know not any thing;” considered.

The evidence of a future state after death, next to the Bible, being sanctioned and corroborated by it, is deduced from the sensible manifestation of departed spirits. If it is established that one person after death has been seen and conversed with, it follows that there is a state of consciousness after death. But the instances of their appearance are innumerable. The sacred scriptures themselves bear witness to the facts in the case, in more than one instance.

SAMUEL APPEARED TO KING SAUL.

We have before referred to this case, but recur to it once

more, in this connexion, for the purpose of impressing it more strongly on the reader's mind. For, we are free to confess that the more we consider that history, 1 Samuel xxviii., the more complete the evidence of existence after death appears to us to be established by it.

1. Samuel was dead and buried in Rama.

2. At Endor, about sixty miles distant, lived a woman, who, by her conjurations and magical incantations, professed to be able to call forth the spirits of the dead.

3. Saul, in disguise, sought her aid to obtain an interview with Samuel, his deceased friend. And she, at the risk of her life, undertook to bring him up, and did do it.

4. Saul recognised Samuel, and Samuel Saul; and each entered into free conversation with the other: Saul excusing his conduct, and Samuel reproving him, and foretelling his doom, complaining at the same time of being disquieted in being brought up.

5. All these facts are related as a history of a real transaction. There is no chance, without doing the utmost violence to the passage, for spiritualizing it.

6. His body could not have been there, for it was buried about sixty miles distant.

If this is a true history, the spirits of the departed are in a state of consciousness. There is no way of evading it but to deny the truth of the narrative.

MOSES ON THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION.

The history of Moses' death is thus related, Deut. xxxiv. 5—7: "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there, in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day. And Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died: his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

The history of a subsequent visit of Moses to the earth, is related Luke ix. 28—31: "And it came to pass, about eight days after these sayings, he took Peter, and John, and James, and went up into a mountain to pray. And, as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening. And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias."

In reference to this circumstance we remark, 1st, that Moses appeared there as really as Elias or Elijah, and conversed with our Saviour.

2. That there is no evidence that Moses was raised from the dead. On the contrary, it is expressly declared that Christ should be "the first that should rise from the dead." Acts xxvi. 23. To talk of God's having raised Moses to confound the devil in his dispute with Michael, is absurd in the light of this text.

He is also said to be "the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Col. i. 18. He is also "the first fruits of them that slept." 1 Cor. xv. 20.

Moses, therefore, could not have been raised at the time of the transfiguration; for it was before the resurrection of Christ. He, like Samuel, must, therefore, have appeared there in spirit, and hence was in a state of consciousness out of the body in death.

To this, it is sometimes replied, "Moses was probably raised from the dead for the occasion, and returned to his grave when it was ended." But this is an assumption only, and has not a word of proof from the scriptures, and is therefore inadmissible. Others say, it was only a vision, and no substance or reality in the appearance; and, in proof, they quote the Saviour's charge to the disciples, "Tell the *vision* to no man," &c. Of all the weak and puerile objections ever devised and urged, this is the most weak. The Greek word *οραμα*, rendered vision, Matth. xvii. 9, is from *οραω*, to see, to behold, and is defined, "a thing seen, a sight, appearance, a supernatural appearance, a vision."

Mark and Luke understood the charge in the sense of "a thing seen." Mark thus relates it, ix. 9: "He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead." Luke ix. 36: "And they kept it close, and told no man in those days any of these things which they had seen."

The vision, or the things they had seen, were, Christ transfigured—Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and conversed with Christ concerning his death—and a white cloud of glory which enveloped the company, and from which the Father's voice came. If this was not reality, there can be no dependence placed on any historical fact related by the evangelists.

Both Samuel and Moses, while dead, did appear to and converse with the living. Men may quibble as they please, they cannot disprove these narrated facts.

Objection.—To admit consciousness after death would be a palpable contradiction of the Bible, which declares, Eccl. ix. 5, in so many words, "The dead know not any thing."

THE DILEMMA.

Then the case stands thus: The Bible relates the history of the death and burial of two men; and subsequently relates the history of the visible and conscious appearance of each of them to eye and ear witnesses, and that without a resurrection. They must, therefore, have consciousness after death.

Again. The Bible declares, "The dead know not any thing." The two testimonies contradict each other, and thus are neutralized. Shall we admit this position? We are not prepared to do so. Shall we then throw away any one of the passages, and retain the other? Some may be prepared to do it, but we are not of the number. For if one must be rejected as spurious, which shall it be? Has not one as much claim on our faith as the other? How then shall the case be met? We reply, by interpreting it according to the analogy of faith: by seeking a principle of interpretation which will harmonize all that is said on the subject. Wherever that principle is found, there is the truth. One or other of these plans must be adopted. Either reject one or both texts, or harmonize the whole. But, how shall they be harmonized? We reply, the cases of Samuel and Moses are plain historical narratives, and do not admit of spiritualizing, construing, or mystifying. We are compelled to admit or reject them as a matter of history.

But, how is it with the other text, "The dead know not any thing?" We reply, that after a careful search among the advocates of the unconsciousness of the dead, we have not yet had the fortune to find a man who will abide by the literal reading of the text. Eccl. ix. 1—6. We include the first six verses, to present the sense entire. We expect the above announcement will strike many as very strange and erroneous; and they may think themselves exceptions. If so, we wish to examine the text in question, and ask a few questions as we proceed.

The second verse teaches that all things come alike to all—to the righteous and to the wicked—to the good, and the clean and the unclean, &c. "As is the good so is the sinner." Do you, my friend, admit this in its full and literal acceptance? "O, but," says the objector, "the next verse modifies and explains the sweeping assertion in verse second, that all things come alike to all, by restricting it to one thing, namely, death." Very well, we will admit the principle, that the assertions and positions of one part are to modify or be understood in accordance with the other parts of the text, and not in their absolute sense.

But, if you will not admit the absolute literal sense of verse second, will you stand by this, verse fifth, "The living know that they shall die?" Remember, it is the good and bad, righteous and wicked, &c., of whom the passage speaks: it is the living as a whole. We ask, then, Do you believe that declaration in its literal and unqualified sense? Do you know that you will not be an exception? Paul has assured us that, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." Christ has said, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." If this is true, then all the living do not know they shall die. And, hence, the text is to be taken in a limited, and not a full, unrestricted sense. It must, in other words, be understood in accordance with other statements on the same subject. And yet the next clause, "but the dead know not any thing," is not more positive than that "The living know that they shall die." If one is limited and explained by other texts, why not the other also?

But we pass to the next clause of verse fifth, "Neither have they any more a reward." Is this true in its absolute sense? Will they not be brought to judgment? Is it not true that they "shall give account to Him that is ready to judge the *quick* and the *dead*?" And that "the *dead*, small and great, stood before God, and the *dead* were judged?" Rev. xx., and 1 Peter iv. Will they never have a resurrection, to receive in body according to that they have done, whether good or bad? If so, there will be a reward for them again. Will you, then, take the responsibility of saying that the text is true according to its plain literal construction, without limitation or explanation? "No," you will answer, "for that would contradict the general teaching of the Bible. And, besides, the next clause limits and explains the meaning: 'for the memory of them is forgotten.'" The plain meaning is, that death ends their relation to and connexion with the present state of being; they pass from the minds of men, are forgotten by their survivors, and hence have no more a reward from men for either their good or evil deeds. This view of the subject is rendered still more clear by verse sixth: "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." Even this last clause cannot be taken in a literal and unrestricted sense. For both the righteous and wicked are to have a resurrection and retribution on earth, and under the sun. Do you, can you, take it unrestrictedly? It requires explanation in the light of other scriptures, otherwise it is a palpable contradiction.

If so much of the passage is to be explained by other texts, how is it that we must be required to receive one intermediate clause, no more plain than others, without explanation? There can be no good reason assigned, except that the maintenance of a certain theory requires it.

But we shall be asked, "What explanation we would give the text?" We reply, we would explain it by harmonizing it with other scriptures. We would ask, "What is the effect of death on man, according to the general teaching of the scriptures?" The answer would be found thus expressed: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." Eccl. xii. 7. From this we learn that the local fate of body and spirit are different. But what is their sensible condition? Answer, "The body without the spirit is dead." James ii. 26. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Matth. x. 28. The body is here recognised as dead, while the soul is not killed.

Again. "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." 2 Cor. iv. 16.

Once more. "Knowing that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight;) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 2 Cor. v. 6—8. The above text teaches us that the body may be left behind, and another part be present with the Lord, which is absent from the Lord while at home in the body. This is in accordance with the wise man, that the body returns to dust, and the spirit to God. It is according to Christ, that those who can kill the body are not able to kill the soul. It is in accordance with Paul, that while the outward man perishes, the inward man is renewed.

It is also in harmony with the following, from Philippians i. 22—25: "But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better; nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith."

Concerning this text, we are told by some that it refers to the resurrection, and is expressive of Paul's desire for that event. And to sustain the view, it is said the word *'αναλω*, rendered in the text *depart*, means also to *come, come away*, &c., and that

it should be so read here—thus: “Having a desire to *come*, and to be with Christ,” &c. This is a most specious argument, at first sight; but none will acknowledge its force, except those who are accustomed to swallow what is given them, without the trouble of examination. A single reflection will expose its barefaced fallacy. It is utterly irreconcilable with the whole tenor of Paul’s remarks. “To die is gain.” “To abide in the flesh is more needful for you.” “I am in a strait betwixt two.”

There were two conflicting attractions:—to die—to abide in the flesh. In view of these two influences, he says, I do not know which to choose. “For I am in a strait betwixt the two;” or, “I am perplexed of the two,” which is a more literal reading; “having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better; nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you; wherefore, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith.” All is here plain and simple; but adopt the proposed rendering, how incongruous! Let us try it. “To die is gain; but if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall choose, I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to *come*, and to be with Christ, which is far better. Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. Wherefore, I know that I shall abide,” &c. What perfect jargon! And how any person making any pretensions to an argumentative mind could ever put such an argument before the public, is mysterious.

But the literal import of the word rendered *depart*, is “*to dissolve or unloose*.” Having an earnest desire to dissolve, and to be with Christ, &c., but “to abide in the flesh,” &c. This presents the true idea. There is, then, a spirit of man which departs to God at death, and is present with him. The body is dead, it knows nothing; it is a mortal body, dead body, &c. But the scriptures never speak of a dead spirit, nor mortal spirit; and hence the unconsciousness cannot be affirmed of it, but of the living man, as such, and as connected with this state. The fact, therefore, of the appearance of Samuel and Moses after death, does not militate against the declaration that the dead know not any thing; while we understand that term as applying to the body, which is dead without the spirit, or to the man as such, and not of the spirit which returns to God, and “lives according to God in spirit.” 1 Pet. iv. 6.

While on this subject we will turn to Psalm cxlvi. 3, 4: “Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his

earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Here we have another of the strong declarations supposed by some to teach the entire unconsciousness of all who have departed this life. Let us ask, why are we not to put our trust in princes or in the son of man? The answer is at hand: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." For this reason no trust is to be placed in them; for, however good their thoughts, designs, or purposes are, they have no ability, because of their frailty to fulfil them. As soon as death comes, their purposes end. Is this not clearly the meaning of the text? The common error consists in confounding the spirit, the thinking agent, with the thoughts, the work of that agent. It is not so; a purpose of the agent may fail, and yet it does not affect the existence of the agent. The purposes of man, which he thought to accomplish, perish at death; but the conscious spirit, which thought and purposed, returns to God. It is surprising that any one should ever have presented that text in proof of unconsciousness after death. It has no bearing on the subject.

Having shown the fact of the appearance of departed spirits, from the Bible, we now proceed to relate

AN APPARITION OF TWO DECEASED PERSONS.

The narrative is given to the world on the authority of the late Rev. Richard Watson, an eminent minister of the Wesleyan connexion in England, who had it from Mr. Mills, the person who was connected with the transaction. It is said to have been first published in the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, while under the editorial charge of Rev. Joseph Benson, a distinguished Methodist commentator. The circumstances were of such a nature as to confirm the reality of the appearance. Let those get clear of its force who can.—ED.

"Mr. Mills had travelled a circuit in England in which lived a man by the name of James, with whom, his wife and children, he had been intimately acquainted, and at whose house he had lodged in passing around the circuit.

"He left the circuit, after having travelled it one year, to attend the conference, and was again returned to it the second time. But in the interim, an epidemic disease had prevailed in the place where James resided, and both himself and his wife were carried off by it suddenly, and within a short time of each other. Mr. Mills, however, as usual went to his old lodging, which was then occupied by the children; but felt gloomy and

distressed at finding the abode no longer enlivened by the presence of its former pious heads, who had been his intimate friends; and in this state of mind retired to rest, in the same room in which, on former occasions, he had been in the habit of sleeping.

“Soon after lying down, however, Mr. Mills, with considerable astonishment, heard, as he supposed, some persons whispering in an adjoining room, into which he immediately repaired to ascertain who they were, but found no one. He again laid down, and concluded that he must have been mistaken; but the circumstance brought to his recollection a rumour which he had heard at a place not very far distant, and to which he had paid but little attention, that James and his wife had been several times seen since their death. While thinking of this rumour, he again heard the whispering renewed—this increased his surprise; and a second time he arose and searched the room, but met with no better success. He arose the third time, but, after a strict search, could find no one. After this, he resolved to disregard it, and fell into a sleep and heard nothing more. The next morning, he left the house, without mentioning the circumstances to the children, to attend an appointment about three miles distant; and, as usual, dined at the house of a pious old lady in the neighbourhood of the place. This woman, though poor and aged, had always insisted on the preachers staying with her, and through respect for age and excellent character, they indulged her wishes. She had provided for Mr. Mills a frugal repast, but declined eating with him, stating that she preferred waiting upon him. The old lady was generally known by the familiar name of Nanny, and by this name she was called by all the preachers. While Mr. Mills was eating his morsel, Nanny, who was seated at some distance from him, said, ‘Mr. Mills, I have one request to make of you.’

“‘Well, Nanny,’ he replied, ‘what is it?’

“‘Why,’ said she, ‘that you preach my funeral sermon next Sabbath.’

“‘The request astonished Mr. Mills, who, looking at her, said,

“‘Nanny, what is the matter with you? have you lost your senses?’

“‘O no, sir,’ she replied, ‘I know perfectly well what I am talking about, for I shall die on Friday at three o’clock in the afternoon; and though you will be some miles from this place, I want you to comply with my request: and if you have ever known any thing good of me, that may be serviceable to others, you can tell it.’

" 'But,' said Mr. Mills, 'before I must promise to comply with your request, I should be much gratified if you would inform me how you know you will die on Friday, this being Tuesday.'

" 'Then, sir, I will inform you. You know that reports have been in circulation, that James and his wife have been seen in different places since their death.'

" 'True,' said Mr. Mills, 'but I regarded it as mere rumour.'

" 'But, sir,' she replied, 'I saw them this morning.'

" 'You saw them!'

" 'Indeed I did, sir. Early this morning, while sweeping my entry, I looked up toward the road and saw two persons, a man and a woman, coming toward the house, who appeared to me to resemble James and his wife. I ceased to sweep, and looked steadily at them until they came near to me, when I found that it really was them.'

" 'Were you not afraid?' said Mr. Mills.

" 'Me afraid, Mr. Mills?' she replied, 'what had I to fear? Indeed I was not afraid, for I knew James and his wife in this world, and I am sure they were good people, and I was quite certain they had not become bad since they left it.'

" 'Well, sir, as I was saying, they came up to me, and I said, 'James, is that you?' and he said, 'Yes, Nanny, it is me; you are not deceived, and this is my wife.' And I said, 'James, are you happy?' and he replied, 'I am, and so is my wife, and our happiness far exceeds any thing we ever conceived of in this world.' But, said I, 'James, if you are so happy, why have you returned?' To which he replied, 'Strange as it may appear to you, there is still a mysterious tie existing between us and our friends in this world, which will not be dissolved until the resurrection; and also, Nanny, you know that I and my wife died suddenly, in consequence of which, it has been supposed that I left no will; and in order to prevent some uneasiness which is likely to exist among the children respecting my property, we have been permitted to return to the world and inform some persons that I did make a will, and where it may be found. We went,' he continued, 'last night to our former mansion, to inform Mr. Mills respecting the will, but found he was somewhat frightened, and therefore concluded not to tell him, but to see you this morning and request of you to inform him, as he will dine with you to-day, for we passed him on the road; and we knew, Nanny, that you would not be frightened.' 'No indeed, James, I am not alarmed,' I replied, 'for I am vast glad

to see you, especially since you are happy.' 'The will,' he said, 'is in a private drawer, in the desk, which opens with a spring, (here giving a full description of it,) which the children do not know of, and the executors live in the neighbourhood. Request Mr. Mills,' he said, 'to return to the house after dinner, and he will find the will, and can see the executors, and can have things satisfactorily settled in the family. And,' said he, 'Nanny, we were permitted to inform you, that on Friday next, at three o'clock in the afternoon, you will die, and be with us.' 'Oh, James,' I replied, 'I am vast glad to hear it, I wish it was Friday now.' 'Well,' said he, 'be ready, for the messenger will come and call at the hour.' I replied, 'Don't fear, James, by the grace of God I will be ready.' And they left me.

"Mr. Mills heard the account with no small degree of astonishment; and concluded to return to the house from whence he came in the morning.

"Without the least difficulty, he found the drawer and will. He also saw the executors, and was pleased to find that the will gave full satisfaction to all concerned. On the following Friday, pious Nanny died, and Mr. Mills informed Mr. Watson that he preached her funeral sermon on the following Sabbath.

"Mr. Watson imparted to Mr. Summerfield that he had always been an unbeliever on the subject of apparitions, but that he did most fully credit this account."

HELL OR HADES.

"On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Matth. xvi. 18.

It is not our design at present to discuss the question, Who is the rock on which the church of Christ is built? But, as a Protestant, take for granted that it is Christ, as taught in various scriptures. "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. iii. 11. In him, therefore, all our hopes rest for present pardon and eternal life. And to those who believe, he is precious; but to them that are disobedient, a stone of stumbling and rock of offence. 1 Pet. ii.

We shall, in the present discourse, consider:—

I. *The import of the term hell.* And,

II. *Why the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church of Christ.*

There are three Greek words used in the Greek testament, each of which is rendered in the common translation *hell*: *hades*, *gehenna*, and *tartarus*.

Hades is always used in the Bible in reference to the place of the dead, and never to express the final doom of the wicked. This is an important point to be kept in mind, and we therefore call special attention to the fact.

Gehenna is the word used by our Saviour, as expressive of the place of final punishment of the wicked, into which both soul and body shall be cast. Matth. x. 28, Mark ix. 43—49.

Tartarus is used by the apostle, 2 Pet. ii. 4, as the prison of the angels who sinned, where, with chains of darkness, they are bound till the judgment.

The word used in our text is *hades*. It is compounded of *a*, used as a negative particle, not, and the verb *εἶδω*, *I see*. *Hades*, therefore, literally signifies *unseen*: the invisible abode or mansion of the dead. It does not refer to any definite locality, but embraces in its import the whole universe of space, wherever a departed spirit exists. There are ministering spirits attending on those who shall be heirs of salvation, who must be very near us, and even it is said, "In their hands they shall bear thee up." Yet they are invisible to us in our natural or normal condition—they, therefore, are in the invisible world, and yet in immediate proximity to us. So with all who depart this life, there must be a moment when the soul departs from the body; yet, although it is present, is invisible: hence, in *hades*, or the invisible world. Every part of the universe is therefore embraced in the term; even heaven itself, where God, angels, and spirits of just men made perfect, have their abode, because it is invisible to man in his natural state.

In the light of these remarks, we will turn to Acts ii. 27, 31. "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, or *hades*, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." "He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in *hades*, neither did his flesh see corruption." Christ's soul, therefore, was in *hades*, or the invisible world, during the time of his death; and yet he was in the paradise, where he promised the dying thief he should that day be with him. Paradise, therefore, is embraced in *hades*, because it is invisible. Paradise is in *hades*, as Philadelphia is in Pennsylvania.

That the souls or spirits of the *righteous* are also in *hades* during death, will appear from various texts. The first which

we will notice is 1 Cor. xv. 55: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, or *hades*, where is thy victory?" This is to be the song of triumph after the resurrection of the just. Hades, therefore, has gained a partial victory, but will be dispossessed of its prey.

Hades is not used in the New Testament in the sense of the grave in one instance. It is maintained by some, that *hades* signifies the grave, and has reference to the place of the body in death. That the Hebrew word *sheol*, used frequently in the Old Testament, and rendered into Greek by the word *hades*, sometimes signifies the grave, is freely admitted. But in the New Testament it is never used in any case where the sense requires us to understand the grave or place of the body, but it is used so as to require us to understand it as the place of the soul, in some instances, and there is nothing to forbid its being so understood in any instance. The only place where the English translators of the New Testament have rendered the word *grave*, is 1 Cor. xv. 55, where there is nothing in the text or subject to require that rendering.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS, LUKE XVI.

This narrative is a point of exceeding interest, and has formed the subject of much discussion. If admitted to be a historical narrative, or statement of fact, it for ever puts to rest the question of man's consciousness after death, and hence the many ingenious devices to blunt its point. Various positions have been assumed, but none of them meet the case. For instance, it is said, that it is a parable designed to rebuke the pride and covetousness of the pharisees who were rich, and teach them that a future state is of more importance than the present; and that the scene is laid in a state beyond the resurrection. For, say they, each party is represented as having bodily organs, and exercising them, which it would be absurd to affirm of a spirit.

To this we reply, that is assuming what remains to be proved, that a spirit has not bodily although not physical organs, and that those organs have not the power of sensation. All that we learn of spirits from the Bible, teaches that human spirits have all the appearance of living men, but have not flesh and bones.

Again, we reply, the scene is not laid beyond the resurrection, but after death. "The rich man also died, and was buried; and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in torment," &c. "The beggar died, and was carried by angels to Abraham's

bosom." Thus the scene is laid immediately after death, and while the rich man had yet five brethren in his father's house, whom he wished to have warned, which will not be, after the resurrection of the wicked.

But the place where the rich man was located, ends the controversy on the point. "In *hades* he lifted up his eyes," &c. Now, that term, as before remarked, is not once used in scripture to signify the place of final punishment after the resurrection, but always means the place and state of the dead. There is not a writer among the materialists but what knows that fact perfectly well; and if they allege it to be beyond the resurrection, they do it with their eyes open, and wilfully pervert the truth. The rich man was in the state of death, in the invisible world, and in a state of consciousness. Here we might leave the point. But we ask, if this is a parable, what does it compare? For it is the nature of parables to compare one thing with another, for purposes of illustration. All our Saviour's parables may be ranged under three heads. 1. Those in which he states directly the subject to be illustrated, and then applies the terms of the parable, and shows its bearing as in Matth. xiii. 2. Those which are designed to convey a moral lesson, and that moral drawn; or, 3d, Those which are so obvious as to suggest the meaning by the terms, the manner and circumstances of the parable.

But the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus does not come under either head, as is manifest in the fact that no one can point out any consistent subject of comparison. Again, therefore, we ask, if it is a parable, what does it compare? And we pause for a reply. For until some point of comparison can be pointed out in it, we are bound to receive it as a statement of facts: that in *hades*, the invisible world, a good man was comforted and a wicked man tormented.

CHRIST AND JOSEPHUS, THE JEWISH HISTORIAN.

We now proceed to give in parallel columns the narrative as given by Christ, and the faith of the Jews of that age, as related by their historian, who was cotemporary with Christ and his apostles.

CHRIST, LUKE XVI. 19—31.

“There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man’s table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried, and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father’s house: for I have five brethren; that he

JOSEPHUS.

1. Now, as to Hades, wherein the souls of the righteous and unrighteous are detained, it is necessary to speak of it. Hades is a place in the world not regularly finished—a subterraneous region, wherein the light of this world does not shine; from which circumstance, that in this region the light does not shine, it cannot be but there must be in it perpetual darkness. This region is allotted as a place of custody for souls, in which angels are appointed as guardians to them, who distribute to them temporary punishments, agreeable to every one’s behaviour and manners.

2. In this region there is a certain place set apart, as a lake of unquenchable fire: whereinto we suppose no one hath hitherto been cast, but it is prepared for a day afore determined by God, in which one righteous sentence shall deservedly be passed upon all men; when the unjust, and those that have been disobedient to God, and have given honour to such idols as have been the vain operations of the hands of men as to God himself, shall be adjudged to this everlasting punishment, as having been the causes of defilement; while the just shall obtain an incorruptible and never-fading kingdom. These are now, indeed, confined in Hades, but not in the same

may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, 'They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.'

place wherein the unjust are confined.

3. For there is one descent into this region, at whose gate we believe there stands an archangel with a host; which gate, when those pass through that are conducted down by the angels appointed over souls, they do not go the same way, but the just are guided to the right hand, and are led with hymns, sung by the angels appointed over that place, unto a region of light, in which the just have dwelt from the beginning of the world; not constrained by necessity, but ever enjoying the prospect of the good things they see, and rejoicing in the expectation of those new enjoyments which will be peculiar to every one of them, and esteeming those things beyond what we have here: with whom there is no place of toil, no burning heat, no piercing cold, nor are any briers there; but the countenance of the fathers and of the just, which they see, always smiles upon them, while they wait for that rest and eternal new life in heaven which is to succeed this region. This place we call the bosom of Abraham.

4. But as to the unjust, they are dragged by force to the left hand by the angels allotted for punishment, no longer going with a good will, but as prisoners driven by violence; to whom are sent the angels appointed over them to reproach them and threaten them with their terrible looks, and to thrust them still downward. Now, those angels that are set over these souls, drag them into the neighbourhood of hell itself; who, when they are hard by it, continually hear the noise of it, and do not stand clear of the hot vapour itself; but when they have a near view of this spectacle, as of a terrible and exceeding great prospect of fire, they are struck with a fearful expectation of a future judgment, and in effect punished thereby; and not only so, but where they see the place (or choir) of the fathers and of the just, even hereby are they punished; for a chaos deep and large is fixed between them; insomuch that a just man that hath compassion upon them cannot be admitted, nor can any one that is unjust, if he were bold enough to attempt it, pass over it."

Our argument is this: Christ was addressing the pharisees, who believed according to the foregoing history, concerning the

dead, just what he was relating; he related it as a matter of fact, and never on any occasion corrected the impression that it was such; and the pharisees must have been confirmed by it in their belief, which, if it was false, Christ was bound to correct instead of confirming. If it was false, he certainly was a false teacher, for confirming instead of correcting error. Thus, we learn that in hades there are departments of both comfort and torment for departed spirits.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not believe hades to be a place of conscious torment, because either Josephus or Plato, or their associates taught it; but because Jesus Christ, the faithful and true witness, when discoursing with those who believed it, confirmed their belief by teaching, either by a parable or a fact, the same doctrine, without ever correcting it. It may have been either a parable or fact, this will not alter the case; the doctrine taught, and the influence of teaching, are the same—a confirmation of previously entertained sentiment, which, if erroneous, he should have corrected.

The most plausible solution of the difficulty is that of Mr. Dabney, who rids himself of its force by assuming the resurrection to take place at death. True, he is not quite willing to father Professor Bush's theory, but confessing that the usual interpretation is not satisfactory, he presents this as an entirely satisfactory solution if true.

But there is one consideration entirely fatal to his theory, beside the deathly resurrection: it is the fact that in *hades*, not *gehenna*, the rich man lifted up his eyes, being in torment. Neither Mr. Dabney, nor any other theologian, by any legitimate process, can rid himself of this argument to prove the whole scene to be laid by our Saviour after death, and before the resurrection.

We can but marvel when we hear men of sense and students of the Bible affirm, with so much boldness, as they sometimes do, that there is not a text in the Bible which teaches the consciousness of man after death. They know, every one of them, that Luke xvi. positively teaches it, and that they never yet gave a satisfactory solution of the difficulty to their theory.

We now come to the second head of our subject: *Why the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church of Christ.*

The various crude opinions which prevail in reference to *the gates of hell*, first demand our attention. Some suppose it to mean the devil, and that the promise is a pledge that the old serpent shall not be able to do injury to, or overthrow any ec-

clesiastical body, composed of true Christians; or that the true catholic or universal church of Christ will not be overcome by his devices. Others call wicked men the gates of hell, and assume that they will never prevail to overthrow the church. Hence, in times of great trial with any branch of the church, it is a frequent remark: "They need not fear if they are really the church of Christ, for he has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The church of Rome, on the authority of this text, assumes that God will always protect and preserve her inviolate.

But nothing of this is promised in the text. Individual churches, the most pious and devoted to God, have always been subjected to persecution, and many times to extermination, by the enemies of Christ. Corruptions crept into even the apostolic churches, until they became corrupt and apostate: and the church of Rome, if her claim to apostolical succession is good for any thing, is an example.

But Christ does promise to his church that he will rescue her entire and perfect from the dominion of death and hades, the place of the dead, by the resurrection. Hence, he proclaims, Rev. i. 18: "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of death and of *hades*." The Christian is not, therefore, to fear them that can kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul. The spiritual principle survives, and, at the resurrection, hades, the invisible world, will yield its trust as death does its prey, and both come forth perfected to enjoy eternal life, as members of the body of Jesus Christ. Christ has the keys of both death and hell, or hades, and will throw wide open the iron gates—they shall not prevail against his church, no, not even one member of it.

"Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?" But, until that day, we are assured by the prophet Daniel, chap. vii., that the little horn of his fourth symbolic beast shall make war with the saints, and prevail against them, until the Ancient of days shall come, and the time shall come that the saints shall possess the kingdom. May both reader and writer be prepared to inherit that kingdom.

DEMONIACAL MIRACLES.

We are informed by the spirit of inspiration, of the deceptions which will be practised in the closing history of the world, through the agency of demons. Rev. xvi. gives us the prophetic history of the pouring out of the last seven plagues. After the pouring out of the sixth plague, we are told that those unclean spirits, like frogs, went forth "out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet; for they are the spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth to the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

The spirits of demons are here said to be the agents who work miracles so astounding as to deceive the kings of the earth and of the whole world. The general skepticism of the age, with regard to demoniacal power, has almost excluded from the world the idea that any real miracles can be performed by their agency; and thus every prodigy, really established to be such, is attributed to God. By the prevalence of this opinion, Satan and his emissaries have gained a great advantage; and by a show of miracles and inspirations, they have succeeded in deceiving thousands to their eternal ruin.

The great pretensions of Mormonism are principally sustained and advanced by the claim to miraculous power. True, there are many who treat it all with contempt, denying that any miracles are really performed, and thus escape the snare; while others, persons of intelligence and sound minds, witness their performance with wonder, and yield to the claims of the system, and become its dupes.

It may be asked, if they do really perform miracles in proof of their divine mission, how shall we resist the evidence? Christ has answered the question for us. "By their fruits ye shall know them." "Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out demons, and in thy name done many wonderful works? Then will I profess to them, I never knew you." Again, "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets; they shall show great signs and wonders, so that they shall deceive, if possible, the very elect." The apostle Paul also says, I Cor. xiii., "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing."

There may be miracles performed, therefore, in the name of God and Christ, professedly for his glory, which he does not perform. Let no miracle, therefore, be received in proof of the holiness of its performer, or the truth of his doctrine. Miracles are predicted to take place in these last days, but they are to be done by false Christs and false prophets and demons, and do not establish the truth of any doctrine. To determine the character of an individual or his system of religion, we should ask, How does it affect the morals and piety of those who come under his or its influence? Does it agree with the Bible, as a whole? If it does agree with the word of God, we do not need miracles to prove it; if it does not, we cannot receive it with the most astounding miracles to prove it. If it does make men holy, and lead them to love and obey God, and do good to men, we can receive such doctrine without miracles; but if the reverse, no miracles can prove it to be from God.

The claims of the Roman Catholic church are based, in a great measure, on her miracle-working power; and millions have been brought under her influence by the exhibition of such prodigies. If we may believe her own records, the performance of miracles was the great secret of the success of St. Francis Xavier, her great apostle to the Indies; and of hosts of other missionaries to the heathen world. How are her miracles performed? We will not say that none of the works recorded were wrought by divine power, in answer to prayer to God. But this we do say, that the greater portion of the recorded miracles of the church of Rome have been wrought by the agency of those who have invoked the aid of departed spirits, and have sacrificed to the dead. We are aware that this is a heavy charge, but shall substantiate it from their own records.

We shall first quote from Father Ripa's "Residence at the Court of Peking," translated by F. Prandi. New York, Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway.

Father Ripa was sent out to China as one of a company of missionaries, in the year 1708. In giving an account of his retention in the river Thames, awaiting the departure of the vessel in which he was to sail, he says, page 28: "Wishing to make choice of some tutelar saint who might be our protector during the voyage, we assembled together, and proceeded in the following manner: We agreed that each of us should write down the name of a saint upon three separate slips of paper, that these should be put into a box, and the saint whose name should first be drawn three times should be our patron. The

first slip of paper drawn contained the name of St. Joseph; the second, the same name; the third, that of St. Paul; the fourth, again that of St. Joseph, who was thus declared our tutelar saint."

Observe, this saint was chosen as their patron, to be their protector during their voyage. In him they trusted for protection and deliverance. If, therefore, they received miraculous deliverance, it must be through his agency, otherwise it is vain to select such a patron.

One of his miraculous deliverances he thus records, page 42: "In the straits of Malay, not far from Singapore, we were very nearly lost; the navigation of those seas being extremely dangerous, owing to a multitude of little islands, which, opposing the waves in all directions, form a labyrinth of eddies and whirlpools. One day while I was at my morning devotions, I suddenly heard a dreadful noise under the ship, followed by a great uproar and confusion above my head; and, almost at the same moment, an American merchant burst into my cabin, and, without uttering one word, seized my arm and led me on deck, and I then perceived that the vessel had been driven upon a rock, and was near sinking. I immediately rushed back into my cabin, and taking the holy water, and a candle of the holy father, Innocent XI., I first blessed the sea, then broke the candle into pieces, and threw it to the waves, well knowing its miraculous powers in similar cases. Very soon after I had done this, we were out of danger."

Here was, evidently, if not a prayer to St. Joseph, a sacrifice offered to Innocent XI., and his aid sought in the hour of danger. But, according to Father Ripa's account, the offering was effectual.

But I may as well give the sequel, and let Father Ripa inform the reader how Innocent XI., or, as he chooses to say, God, wrought the deliverance, even at the risk of exciting the reflection that there is but a step between the sublime and the ridiculous. He says, "The means God, in his ineffable goodness, employed to save us, were, that the boat of another ship, taking one of our anchors, went and lowered it at a considerable distance, and enabled us to tow the vessel out of its fearful position."

Thus, between the blessing of the sea with holy water, the protection of St. Joseph, and the sacrifice of Father Innocent XI.'s candle, and God's goodness, the assistance of another vessel, and their own exertions. they were rescued. We ask,

is this Christianity? Can pagan idolatry and superstition exceed it in absurdity? If it was not sacrificing to and invoking or worshipping of demons, then paganism never did it.

But after many years' residence in China, in the service of the emperor, his way as a missionary being hedged up, and no prospect of its being opened appearing, notwithstanding he occupied his place by command of his superiors, he determined on returning to Naples. But many and great obstacles were to be overcome in order to accomplish his purpose. No European had ever asked leave to quit the emperor's service, unless he happened to be disabled; and to obtain permission to do so, in health, seemed next to impossible. But on taking his final resolution to go home, he elected another patron saint. But we will let him relate the circumstance in his own way:—

“The project of quitting the post assigned to me by my superiors had previously occurred to my mind, as stated above, and had often been the subject of my prayers; nevertheless, it was a step of so serious a nature, that I dared not execute it on my sole responsibility. Now, however, I placed myself under the patronage of the holy apostle Saint Matthew, shut myself up, and went through a course of religious exercises. After several days of constant meditation and prayer, I felt so strengthened in my purpose, that I finally resolved to depart.”

Under this patronage his way was wonderfully opened, and he returned to Europe with five Chinese. During the homeward voyage there were several miraculous occurrences in which saintly interference was invoked and help obtained. The following may interest the reader and illustrate our point:—

“On the night of the 10th of April we had a tremendous storm. From the roaring of the sea and the winds, it seemed as though the vessel would be dashed into a thousand pieces, at every moment. This was the first time in my life that I had seen a sea-storm in all its terrific fury. Thanks to Heaven, it did not last more than an hour; after this, the wind abated, and was succeeded by a heavy rain, which continued to fall without intermission, till the whole crew was reduced to the greatest distress. Not only were their clothes completely soaked, but the water penetrated their chests and the cabins of the officers, and injured a part of the cargo. I was more dead than alive, being afflicted as usual with the sea-sickness, and feeling deeply for the forlorn situation of my poor Chinese, who were drenched with rain and benumbed with cold. Having desired them to join with me, we prayed to God for some time, and in the ful-

ness of my faith I threw an Agnus of his Holiness Innocent XI. into the raging sea, and it was truly wonderful how the furious winds became gentle zephyrs, the sea calm and quiet, and the air so mild that we seemed to be in the midst of the most delightful spring. One of the heretical pilots, who understood the Portuguese language, told me, that when he and the other sailors, who were well acquainted with these seas, beheld such an extraordinary change in the weather as had never been read or heard of, they one and all exclaimed that the course of nature had changed, or else that a miracle had been wrought, and he repeated several times that he had witnessed a miracle which was the work of God. This, from the mouth of a heretic, confirmed me in my belief that so much grace had been vouchsafed for the preservation of the Chinese, who had prayed to that effect, through the intercession of our Holy Father."

Again, page 154, he says:—

"When we reached the latitude of St. Helena, where all the East India Company's ships had strict orders to touch, we sailed for several days without being able to discover the island. As the season was far advanced, the officers at last resolved that unless it could be found within twenty-four hours, we must sail direct for England; but they entertained great fears of incurring the displeasure of their employers. Upon this I immediately told the Chinese that at sunrise on the following day, which was that of St. Anthony of Padua, I expected them to join me in prayer in order to implore the patronage of this great saint. They did so; and our fervent supplications were not even ended, when, to the great joy of all on board, the much-desired coast appeared in sight."

We repeat, in view of these recorded facts, that the miracles of the church of Rome, by the confession of those who perform them, are wrought in answer to the invocation of and sacrificing to departed spirits; if not always, yet generally. It is but just, then, that we characterize them as the miracles of demons. The transactions recorded by Father Ripa are gross acts of idolatry, and, as such, it is but just that the worshipper should be subjected to the deceptions of demoniacal power.

THE VIRGIN MARY.—ANOTHER MIRACLE.

We subjoin the following illustration of Romish miracles in this country; in which the same fact, the invocation of a departed spirit, is placed foremost, and the priest acknowledges he trusted in the virgin's powerful intercession, for the fulfilment of his promise.

"A MODERN MIRACLE.—We copy the following narrative from the *Freeman's Journal* of last week."—*N. Y. Spectator*, Oct. 18, 1848.

From the Wahrheit's Freund.

[Translated for the Catholic Advocate.]

REMARKABLE CONVERSION.

Diocess of Milwaukie, St. Anthony, July 31st, 1848.

MR. EDITOR:—The undersigned requests, for the greater glory of God, to have the following inserted in the *Wahrheit's Freund*:—

"The readers of the *Wahrheit's Freund* will remember that last winter, in St. Anthony's congregation, the wife of a Protestant was converted during her sickness, and made her profession of the Catholic faith. From that time it was her ardent desire that her husband should follow her in embracing the faith, or, at least, allow their three children to be received into the Catholic church. But all her persuasions were of little effect. Being already convinced of many errors in his own belief, he, however, continued at times to use blasphemous expressions in regard to Catholic doctrines.

"At length, about six weeks ago, he was induced to say one Hail Mary every Sunday, with a promise that something particular would happen in his favour before long. This promise was made by the pastor of this place, without being induced to it by any consideration save that of trusting in the powerful intercession of the Mother of God. In about three weeks after this, he unexpectedly spoke to his wife about having their children conditionally baptized. On hearing this, all who knew him were astonished. Sunday, the 16th of July, was appointed for this purpose. Rev. M. Salzman, with two seminarians, were invited by the pastor of this place to assist on the occasion. A procession was formed from the pastoral residence to the church; the three children in the midst, with their hands joined, opened the solemnity. After the baptismal ceremonies, a solemn mass was celebrated, and the whole concluded with the benediction of the most holy sacrament. During the time that the blessed sacrament was exposed, Jesus Christ appeared in the sacred host, under the form of the good shepherd, to the father of the three children, while he stood behind them, about two steps from the altar.

"This apparition was invisible to all others present, but it was sufficiently, nay, abundantly, certified to by the solemn declaration of the man, which he has since confirmed on oath in the

presence of reliable witnesses; and of which the whole congregation was yesterday witness. But still stronger proof was the immediate conversion of the person himself, and also the sudden conversion of a certain Presbyterian, relying solely on the narration given by the individual of what he had seen. Both made together, yesterday, their solemn profession of the Catholic faith, and the former, at the request of the pastor of this place, made, immediately after his profession, the following sworn declaration:—

“Solemn Declaration of Frederick Pallworth, concerning the Apparition he witnessed on the 15th July, 1848, in St. Anthony’s Church, Township 8.

“I, Frederick Pallworth, hereby testify, solemnly and publicly, that I, by the following apparition, was induced to return to the bosom of the Catholic church.

“When my three children were received into the Catholic church, I was assisting at the high mass, and the blessed sacrament was exposed for benediction in the remonstrance; the thought suddenly came into my mind to take a good view of the sacred host; for my belief in the real presence was, up to that time, very wavering, and it was this that kept me back from entering the church. While I thus viewed the sacred host in its usual bread appearance, for about five minutes, and within two steps from it, on a sudden I saw in it a form which I immediately recognised as the image of our Saviour, in which he is usually represented as the Good Shepherd.

“To the left and right of it there remained a small rim in form of a half moon, of the white appearance of bread; the remainder was occupied by the apparition. The Saviour was clad in a dark brown dress, with a shepherd’s hat upon his head, and a lamb on his shoulder. Without feeling troubled, I held one of my eyes closed, in order to see the better, but I still saw the apparition; and, in like manner, when I again looked with both eyes. Before the apparition was over, the benediction ceased, and I beheld again the sacred host in its usual form, so that it lasted about half the time the whole hymn *Pange lingua* was sung. During all the time that I saw the apparition, the priests and clerks were kneeling at the foot of the altar.

“That I had the apparition, with all the circumstances here related, I certify to be true in the presence of those who have known me for several years as their neighbour, and also my perverse conduct in regard to the Catholic faith.

"Given on the 29th of July, the eve of my entrance into the Catholic church, at St. Anthony's, Township 8.

"FREDERICK PALLWORTH."

(Here follow the names of the several witnesses of the above declaration.)

We shall not undertake to determine the truth or falsity of the miracle or apparition; but, admitting its truth, it is undeniable that the Virgin Mary was its author, and hence it was human and not divine. The church of Rome has, in her calendar, some 30,000 saints, each of which is the object of worship, in whom they trust, to whom they pray, and from whom they profess to receive divine and miraculous help.

MESMERISM, DIVINATION, AND MIRACLES.

The subject of mesmerism, so called from Mesmer, a German, who, in the last century, revived the knowledge and practice of the art of producing somnambulism and other phenomena by artificial means, is exerting a sufficient amount of influence at the present time to demand from us a candid examination.

We have proposed to inquire into the subject of modern miracles, and show the means by which impostors can perform them. Among those means, we apprehend mesmerism to be one of the chief.

We propose, first, to show the antiquity of the art; and secondly, to present the reader with the process and philosophy of the art; and thirdly, the dangerous tendency of its practice.

That Mesmer, with the French savans of the last century, revived the art, we freely admit, but they did not originate it. We shall give extracts from the works of the late H. H. Sherwood, M. D., of New York, as exhibiting its antiquity.

Dr. Sherwood says, *Motive Power*, p. 167: "The divine Plato says, 'It is not art which makes thee excel, but a *divine power* which moves thee, (the air.) such as is in the stone which Euripides named the magnet, and some call the Heraclian stone which attracts iron rings.'"

Again, *Motive Power*, p. 149, the Dr. says: "Travellers in eastern countries describe paintings found in the temples of Thebes, and other ancient cities, which represent persons in a sleeping posture, while others are making passes over them. The priests of Chaldea, of Nineveh, of Babylon, of Judea, and Jerusalem, and the priests and physicians of ancient Greece

and Rome, practised magnetism in their temples, and in the healing art, long before the Christian era. Aristotle informs us that Thales, who lived six hundred years before Christ, ascribed the curative properties in the magnet to a soul with which he supposed it to be endowed, and without which he also supposed no kind of motion could take place. Pliny also affirms the magnet to be useful in curing diseases of the eyes, scalds and burns; and Celsus, a philosopher of the first century after Christ, speaks of a physician by the name of Asclepiades, who soothed the ravings of the insane by manipulations, and he adds that his manual operations, when continued for some time, produced a degree of sleep or lethargy."

Once more the Dr. quotes from Plato, page 168:—

"But it was then lawful to survey the most splendid beauty, when we obtained together, in that blessed choir, this happy vision and contemplation. And we indeed enjoyed this blessed spectacle together with Jupiter, but others, in conjunction with some other god; at the same time being initiated in those mysteries, which it is lawful to call the most blessed of all mysteries. And these divine orgies were celebrated by us, while we possessed the proper integrity of our nature, and were freed from the molestations of *evil which awaited us in a succeeding period of time*. Likewise in consequence of this divine initiation, we become spectators of entire, simple, immovable, and blessed visions, resident in a pure light; and were ourselves pure and immaculate, and liberated from this surrounding vestment, which we denominate body, and to which we are now bound like an oyster to its shell."

From the foregoing extracts, it is evident that artificial somnambulism and clairvoyance, as well as the curative powers of magnetism, were known and practised long before Christ, and that it was done by the mesmeric process, as now understood and practised. With these facts before us, the intelligence of the ancient heathen oracles is no longer a mystery; nor yet the prevailing belief among the more intelligent heathen in a spiritual existence after death.

We now proceed to give the process of the art. This we shall do in the language of Deleuze, as quoted by Dr. Sherwood, *Motive Power*, p. 185.

"The following directions for magnetizing are given by Deleuze, who practised the art for more than forty years:—

"When a sick person desires you to attempt to cure him by magnetism, and neither the family nor the physician make ob-

jection to it, if you feel the desire to second his wishes, and are resolved to continue the treatment so long as it shall be necessary, settle with him the hour of the sittings, make him promise to be exact, not to limit himself to an attempt of a few days, to conform himself to your advice in relation to regimen, and not to speak of the undertaking except to persons who ought naturally to be informed of it.

“When you are once agreed, and determined to treat the thing seriously, remove from the patient all persons who would be troublesome; do not keep near you any except necessary witnesses, (one only if it can be so,) and request of them not to occupy themselves at all with the process you employ, nor with the effects that follow, but to unite with you in the intention of doing good to the patient. Arrange things so as not to be too cold or too warm, so that nothing shall interfere with the freedom of your movements, and take precautions to prevent all interruption during the sitting.

“Cause your patient to sit down in the easiest position possible, and place yourself before him on a seat a little more elevated, so that his knees may be between yours, and your feet by the side of his. Demand of him, in the first place, that he give himself up entirely, that he think of nothing, that he do not trouble himself by examining the effects which he experiences, that he banish all fear, and indulge hope, and that he be not disquieted or discouraged if the action of magnetism produces in him temporary pains.

“After you have brought yourself to a state of self-collectedness, take his thumbs between your two fingers, so that the inside of your thumbs may touch the inside of his. Remain in this situation five minutes, or until you perceive there is an equal degree of heat between your thumbs and his; that being done, you will withdraw your hands, removing them to the right and left, and waving them so that the interior surface be turned outwards, and raise them to his head; then place them upon his two shoulders, leaving them there about a minute; you will then draw them along the arm to the extremity of the fingers, touching lightly. You will repeat this *pass* five or six times, always turning your hands, and sweeping them off a little before re-ascending; you will then place your hands upon the head, hold them there a moment, and bring them down before the face, at the distance of one or two inches, as far as the pit of the stomach; there you will let them remain about two minutes, passing the thumb along the pit of the stomach, and the other fingers down

the sides. Then descend slowly along the body as far as the knees, or farther; and, if you can conveniently, as far as the ends of the feet. You may repeat the same processes during the greater part of the sitting. You may sometimes draw nearer to the patient, so as to place your hands behind his shoulders, descending slowly along the spine, thence to the hips, and along the thighs as far as the knees, or to the feet. After the first passes you may dispense with putting your hands upon the head, and make the succeeding passes along the arms, beginning at the shoulder, or along the body, commencing at the stomach.

“When you wish to put an end to the sitting, take care to draw towards the extremity of the hands, and towards the extremity of the feet, prolonging your passes beyond these extremities, and shaking your fingers each time. Finally, make several passes transversely before the face, and also before the breast, at the distance of three or four inches; these passes are made by presenting the two hands together, and briskly drawing them from each other, as if to carry off the superabundance of fluid with which the patient may be charged. You see that it is essential to magnetize, always *descending* from the head to the extremities, and never mounting from the extremities to the head. It is on this account that we turn the hands obliquely when they are raised again from the feet to the head. The descending passes are magnetic, that is, they are accompanied with the intention of magnetizing. The ascending movements are not. Many magnetizers shake their fingers slightly after each pass. This method, which is never injurious, is in certain cases advantageous, and for this reason it is good to get into the habit of doing it.

“When the magnetizer acts upon the patient, they are said *to be in communication* (rapport.) That is to say, we mean by the word *communication*, a peculiar and induced condition, which causes the magnetizer to exert an influence upon the patient, there being between them a communication of the vital principle.”

The effect of this process is to induce the magnetic sleep, in which various phenomena manifest themselves. There are various degrees and states of the magnetic sleep; they are thus given by Dr. Sherwood, *Motive Power*, p. 190:—

LIGHT AND IMAGES OF THE DEGREES.

In the first degree and first state of magnetic sleep, the light is a pale blue.*

In the second degree and second state, the light is a little stronger, and a little deeper blue.

In the third degree and third state, these sleepers are fully under magnetic influence, and the light a clear sky-blue. They see objects in a straight or direct line, through the magnetic medium in space, but not comprehensively, or enclosing various objects as in the natural state.

In the fourth degree and fourth state, the light is stronger, and extends farther than in the lower degrees. Persons with moral organs largely developed, are disposed to see immaterial or spiritual objects in this degree.

In the fifth degree and fifth state, the light is still more intense, and clairvoyants less inclined to view or take cognizance of natural, external, or material objects, but disposed to remain in this exalted state.

In the sixth degree and sixth state, the *tendency* of going into it is instant death, and should be most cautiously avoided.

In the first *state* of magnetic sleep, persons retain more or less of their intellectual faculties, and are more or less susceptible to external influence.

In the second state, the paralysis of the muscles, and the insensibility of the skin is complete—the natural sight lost—the hearing more or less impaired, and a muscular attraction established.

In the third state, a strong sympathy is established between the mind of the subject and the magnetizer—the mind of the former being under the control of the latter.

In the fourth state, the mind of the clairvoyant soars far above that of the magnetizer, and becomes free and independent.

The *philosophy of the mesmeric art* next demands attention.

We have not formed hasty conclusions on this subject; but by experiments, reading, lectures, and exhibitions, we have endeavoured to obtain such an amount of information as would enable us to form an enlightened judgment. It was not enough to witness the phenomena of magnetic sleep induced by others,

* They change from the natural to higher states, as they enter in and advance in the degrees.

together with the other magnetic phenomena, such as perfect paralysis of the body, either in whole or in part, at the will of the magnetizer; also imparting to the subject, or rather exciting in him or her supernatural strength, so that a small boy of twelve years of age could lift several heavy men at a time with apparent ease; the power of clairvoyance, so that the individuals could see and describe things and places hundreds of miles distant, and of which they had no previous knowledge; but we wished to know, by actual experiment, that these phenomena were not the product of deception and collusion. To establish these points, we have tried several persons who had never been under the influence of a magnetizer, and some who were perfect skeptics on the subject, and were able to produce the various classes of phenomena as others have done. We know, as well as actual experiment can give us knowledge, that the alleged facts are true.

From all the light we have been able to gain on this subject, we have arrived at the conclusion that clairvoyance or vision may be induced in three ways: 1st, Sympathetic, in which the mind of the subject is impressed by the magnetizer; 2d, That in which the impressions are made by spiritual agents with whom the subject comes in contact; and 3d, Independent clairvoyance, in which the mind or spirit of the subject sees and otherwise apprehends independently of any other agent. To the first two influences the subject is always liable; and hence, the uncertainty of their responses on any given subject. And even in a state of independent clairvoyance, there is the same uncertainty attached to what they say, on account of their natural temperament and phrenological development. They are in that state in a condition of preternatural excitement, and if there is a natural disposition to prevaricate, the natural restraints of reason and religion are overcome, and they will yield to an excited inclination to say what is not true.

HUMAN MAGNETISM SUBJECT TO THE WILL.

That the magnetic susceptibility is, to a great extent, under the control of the will, is evident from the means necessary to be adopted in order to induce a magnetic state. By referring again to the process of magnetizing, it will be seen that Deleuze gives the following among other directions:—

“Demand of him, (the subject,) in the first place, that *he give himself up entirely*, that he think of nothing, that he do not trouble himself by examining the effects which he expe-

riences, that he banish all fear, and indulge hope, and that he be not disquieted nor discouraged if the action of magnetism produce in him temporary pains. After you have brought yourself to a state of self-collectedness," &c.

From this it will be seen that an entire submission of the will is one of the first prerequisites, and, until it is secured, little or nothing can be done. That submission may be a simple acquiescence, or it may be an actual desire to come under the influence of the other.

The will seems to be the natural barrier which God has reared up to save us from the controlling power of other men and spirits. The first efforts to overcome this barrier are generally required to be strong and protracted. But the subject once fairly broken in, it requires but little effort, frequently only a simple act of the will of the magnetizer to induce the sleep. All persons are capable of producing the effect to a greater or less extent, some of course more than others; and in this art, as in every thing else, practice increases ability. All are more or less susceptible of the magnetic influence; but there is, owing to the various temperaments and phrenological developments, an almost infinite variety of susceptibility. There are some who, it would seem, cannot be affected to the point of magnetic sleep or clairvoyance.

We have said that clairvoyance or vision may be induced in three ways: 1st. by sympathy with the magnetizer or others, he or they impressing the mind by a strong mental effort. This is the means by which *La Roy Sunderland*, in his later exhibitions, produced his results on his subjects, rarely putting them into a state of independent clairvoyance. Yet he would so impress the mind as to excite any passion or emotion which he wished, or make them see what he saw.

Andrew Jackson Davis, the celebrated Poughkeepsie seer, author of *Davis' Revelations*, is an instance of the second mode, impression from some other foreign means. Although he does sometimes see clearly different objects, as a general rule he is impressed, and so expresses himself in his *Revelations*. Nearly all his philosophical and theological productions are given as impressions. He denies, however, that he derives his information from *persons* that exist in another sphere. He thus explains it:—

“My information is not derived from any *persons* that exist in the sphere into which my mind enters, but it is the result of a *law* of truth, emanating from the Great Positive Mind, and

pervading all spheres of existence. By this, truth is attracted to, and is received by the mind."

"To go into the future state," says Davis, "many people suppose that the mind must depart to an indefinite distance from the body, and assume a particular location. This is not so. Mathematically speaking, *two feet* from where I now sit is as much into the future state as any other distance. This consists simply in the *condition* which the mind assumes, and not necessarily in any change of its *location*."

"Information concerning things of which I speak in these discourses, is received while I am in this state of mind. For instance, I know not now what I shall say the next moment, but must first pass off in search of thoughts and truths to be presented next in order."

"Furthermore, the *manner* in which I obtain my information may be compared to a process of chemical analysis. In analyzing a body, the chemist separates its constituents until he has found its simple elements. These are *Truth*. It is by a process of *spiritual* analysis that I obtain truth. I pass from the body with a desire for a particular kind of information. This desire attracts the particular kind of truth of which I would be informed, separates it from all other things, and causes it to flow into the mind. And when I thus obtain the truth of which I am in quest, I return to communicate it through the organization."

Such is Davis' own account of the means by which he obtains knowledge and truth. We, of course, are not able to contradict his assertions; but we must be permitted to dissent from his high claims as to his analysis of all subjects which come before him, reducing them to simples, until only truth remains of them. This conceded, he would be an infallible organ of truth, which few, even of his most ardent friends, are disposed to claim for him. But that he has impressions made on his mind while in that state, entirely above all natural and visible sources of information, his work proves, and it is freely admitted.

The third means of information in a state of clairvoyance is vision—spiritual vision, while all outward senses are locked up. We have witnessed many experiments which furnish ample evidence of the fact, and the testimony of the clairvoyant has confirmed it. Dr. H. H. Sherwood, who practised magnetism for many years as a curative agent, thus testifies: "Some few clairvoyants recollect in their natural state very distinctly many of the objects they see in the magnetic state." In a note, he

says, "We recollect distinctly many objects we see in the magnetic state, and know that we see them literally, as we do with our eyes in the natural, waking state, and we have been in the habit of thus seeing them during the last ten years, and cannot possibly be mistaken."

The author of this last statement we believe to have been a man of veracity, and would take his word on any matter of fact which came under his observation.

We have met with others of the same character who testified to the same thing.

THE SPIRIT LEAVES THE BODY IN CLAIRVOYANCE.

On this point Dr. Sherwood thus speaks, (*Motive Power*, p. 195):—

"We know that their spirits travel, and are present with the patients in these examinations, from the fact that they have the full exercise of all their senses while travelling to different places, and during the examinations of these patients. They see the country and towns they pass through, feel the changes in temperature and climate, hear any uncommon or strange sounds, as the blowing of horns, the noise of steamboats, or the roaring of the falls of Niagara, &c.; notice uncommonly pleasant or disagreeable odours, visit places of amusement, and have a sense of fatigue, hunger, and thirst. Besides, if one of these patients have a paralyzed limb, a corresponding limb of the clairvoyant becomes paralyzed, the same as if the patient was present and having hold of the hand of the clairvoyant. Such are the well ascertained facts, and such is the evidence on this subject, which is deemed perfectly conclusive, no matter how extraordinary it may appear to those who are not initiated into the mysteries of the magnetism of the human system."

Again, p. 199:—

"The following is a specimen of *Clairvoyance* which occurred a few evenings since. When we had got through with the examination of letters from patients, on the evening of the 8th instant, and at about 8 o'clock, we requested the clairvoyant to look and see if there was any money coming on the way in the mails for us, and in two or three minutes, she answered yes! I see a fifty dollar bill for you in a letter, and the letter is in a bag coming from the west. Are you not mistaken in the amount? No, it is fifty, but it—is not a bill, but a draft. Look and see if it is not seventy, instead of fifty dollars. No, it is fifty. Why, how fast it comes!—whiz!—it is coming on

the railroad! The cars arrived here between 10 and 11, in the evening.

"We were expecting a draft from New Orleans of seventy dollars, but instead of that, our clerk on returning from the post-office on the morning of the 9th inst., brought us a letter from a gentleman in Pittsburgh enclosing a draft for fifty dollars.

"On the evening of the 10th inst., after having again got through with the examination of letters from patients, I directed the attention of the clairvoyant to the subject of the above draft, and inquired whether she knew from mere intuition if it was a draft of fifty dollars for me and coming in the mail on the railroad from the west, or saw it literally? When she answered that she saw it literally, as she saw things with her eyes in her natural waking state."

Such is our conviction of the uncertainty of clairvoyance, by whatever means the impression or information is obtained, that we would not trust it on any important subject on the simple authority of the subject's testimony. But where that testimony contains in itself the elements for demonstrating its truth or falsity, we appeal to that evidence.

For instance, we would not receive Dr. Sherwood's testimony, while in a clairvoyant state, as truth, without further evidence; for the simple reason that a clairvoyant is not himself, but acts abnormally. While in his natural state, we would receive his testimony, because we had full confidence in him as a man of truth. His testimony in his natural state, as to what, for ten years he had been in the habit of seeing and remembering, is, with us, weighty evidence.

We would not receive the simple clairvoyant testimony of his subject. But when she stated facts,—such as, that she *saw* in the mail bag in a letter to Dr. Sherwood, a fifty dollar bill or a draft, correcting it from one to the other, coming from the west on the railroad, determining the question in opposition to her magnetizer, that it was fifty, not seventy, dollars; there was a perfect demonstration, when, the next morning, the fifty dollar draft was brought in from Pittsburgh. On that demonstration we rely.

It will naturally be asked, What is the object of this dissertation on magnetism? To this we reply there is a twofold object:—1st, to demonstrate the existence and independent action of the human spirit, which is done by the facts developed in clairvoyance. We regard those facts, which are as fully established as any can be in any department of science, as con-

clusive and incontrovertible evidence of a spiritual existence out of the body. And, secondly, to show how false prophets may predict the future, and perform miracles. Divination by clairvoyance, is something more than pretence; for they do, in that state, undeniably sometimes predict the future with great precision.

It will still be required, on what principle the phenomenon termed *Animal Magnetism* is produced. There are various solutions of the problem, given by different individuals; but as that given by A. J. Davis is presented with clearness, and commends itself as being truly philosophical, we shall in substance present his view. Man possesses two coatings, which are classified as the *serous* and *mucous surfaces*. The *serous* covers each organ, nerve, and fascia of the muscles, including the whole of their surfaces. The mucous surface constitutes the inner of every organ, nerve, and muscle. These two surfaces generate and sustain a positive and negative fluid. This controls the circulation. The negative expands the ventricles, and that attracts the blood to its reservoir. The positive contracts the ventricles, and thus repulses the blood throughout the system. Hence, there is a continual expansion and contraction, attraction and repulsion, which familiarly illustrates the offices of these two forces. They are the motive power of the human system. The *serous* surface is susceptible of feeling—the *mucous* is not. The brain being sensitive, is attractive or positive to all that is existing on the nervous medium. The ethereal substance, which serves as a medium, may be termed *magnetism*. The muscular motion of the system is performed through the medium of the substance which may be called *electricity*. Thus, magnetism is the *positive*, and electricity the *negative force*. When they are equalized in the human organization, the man is perfectly magnetized, and perfect health results. In order to *demagnetize* the man, the equilibrium must be destroyed by extracting the magnetic or positive power, the medium of sensation existing on the nerves by a power still more positive; and this will produce the unconscious state called magnetic.

The state called magnetic may be thus produced. One system coming in contact with another of less positive power, will be attractive, and will attract the positive power from the patient or subject with whom the operator is in contact; and the magnetic force attracted from the subject's system is that which exists upon the nerves of sensation, which terminate in the serous surfaces. This fluid being withdrawn, the patient is not

susceptible of external impressions, simply because the medium by which these are transmitted are *absent*, leaving sensation only on the internal or mucous surface, which produces vital action. The negative power remains, the positive does not.

The outward sensibility will, of course, be in proportion to the extent to which the positive force is abstracted.

The human system is thus controlled by chemical and mechanical forces, and is a coating or a casement to contain its inward properties. "There is another distinct principle," says Davis, "which appears and is evident to me as *spirit*. Also, there is a mediator or medium connecting the spirit with the body: this mediator I know as *sensation*. And when this medium becomes disunited, there is a physical dissolution, and a spiritual elevation to a different sphere of existence."

We have given above an abstract in substance, mostly in the language of Davis. The philosophy of mesmeric phenomena, we think more clearly expressed than we remember to have seen it elsewhere. There are some points, however, in his view of this subject from which we must dissent; and very much in his work in general which we regard as greatly erroneous, and contradictory of revelation and facts. But, truth is truth, no matter where it is found, nor with what combined.

It will be seen by the foregoing remarks, that we have full faith in the facts of magnetism and clairvoyance. But while we believe in the existence of the art, and the facts developed by it, we are entirely opposed to its practice. In short, it will not be too strong an expression to say, we are entirely disgusted with it, and almost sicken at its exhibition.

We object to it, 1st, because, in order to its practice, it requires the entire subjection of the will of the subject to the operator, a submission which we have no right to make but to God. And that subjection once accomplished, there is an exposure of the individual to foreign influences, which God never designed. It is true there are instances where individuals have been put to sleep for the first time without their knowledge or consent, by a strong mental effort on the part of the operator; but then there was a passiveness of the will in the subject, or in other words, no actual resistance. But, as before remarked, the power of resistance once broken, a slight effort will subsequently produce the effect, and a very great effort of the will against it is requisite to prevent the sleep. And frequently all power of resistance is unavailing.

2d. We object to it, because of the evil resulting from it.

In a former number, we referred to the fact that clairvoyance was used for purposes of divination, and gave some instances of charges of theft being fastened on the innocent. This, in itself, is a strong and sufficient objection to the practice. But it is only one of the series. Another fact is, that wicked and designing men make use of it to accomplish their diabolical purposes, enticing and throwing a spell over their victims until they can accomplish what they please; and the more susceptible they find their subject, the more easily it is done. Burglars may use it to discover the place and means of accomplishing their ends, and to learn how to escape detection.

Again, it is the principle of witchcraft. We do not assert that all who practise it, practise witchcraft. By no means; for some practise the art for the best of purposes and with the best of motives, which, if practised from wicked motives, would be witchcraft, and result in great evil to the subject. All the phenomena attributed to witchcraft is produced by the art of magnetism; so that those acquainted with magnetic and psychological phenomena can no longer doubt but that such things have existed and do still exist. Once more, the practice endangers reason, health, and even life itself. With a skilful and practised operator, there is, perhaps, but little danger on that score; but still there is always some. But with the inexperienced there is great danger. There are very many cases on record, and still more never recorded, of frightful results. We give one case from Dr. Sherwood, of a lady who, to gratify the curiosity of a gentleman, undertook to visit the sun. *Motive Power*, pp. 201—2:—

“In the course of five or six minutes, she manifested all the usual symptoms of a complete magnetic sleep, and apprized her interrogator, with some slight degree of irresolution, that she was ready to attempt an inspection of the solar orb. Shortly afterwards, she evinced a highly nervous shrinking, as if from a sense of awe, and said, in answer to an inquiry, that she felt the solar influence to be too powerful for her to persist, and was afraid she would lose her senses—in her own words, she feared ‘that her whole mind would be consumed.’ She was accordingly requested to venture no farther, but remain, if possible, in the position she had acquired, and describe what she saw. She then said that she had now a view of the dark body of the sun—that it was black, but highly lustrous, like “black shining melted metal;” she was confident it was highly metallic, though she could look at it no longer, as it

was again closing up in a degree of brightness which she could not endure.

"Whilst obtaining these answers, the gentleman in communication with her, perceived that her left arm was greatly paralyzed, and the hand became so tightly clenched that he could with difficulty rescue his fingers from the painful grasp. Speedily she announced that she was absolutely paralyzed on the whole of her left side, and was fearful that she would be convulsed all over. She added that 'if she had continued so near the sun a minute longer, the influence would have killed her;' and, as it was, she knew not how she could recover from the convulsions she felt approaching, unless some powerful magnetizer could be obtained to awaken her. Shortly after this, her convulsions became so violent and alarming, as to induce the gentleman who was with her to call for assistance to hold her in the chair. She became unable to speak or hear; she breathed only at long intervals and with great labour: her right hand was kept so forcibly on her heart, that it could not be moved with the united strength of two or three persons; and the action of the heart itself seemed to be almost entirely suspended. The pulse were frightfully intermittent, and for long intervals, wholly imperceptible; the eyes were open, with the pupils half buried beneath the lower lids, and greatly dilated.

"In this state, varied only by convulsive paroxysms of greater or less intensity, she continued nearly four hours, when the writer, who had been detained much beyond the usual time, returned. He found her surrounded by his family and medical assistants, together with a magnetizer and a male clairvoyant who had been sent for to relieve her. Their efforts, however, had produced only slight and transient effects in mitigating her condition, and we now judged it proper to attempt to establish a communication with her, as the only means of awakening her, and with this view, commenced making the long magnetic passes, and then reversed them. The effect of these was very striking, even from the first: producing sudden starts, followed by greater freedom of respiration, and some degree of relaxation of the muscles. The male clairvoyant present being in a magnetic state, recommended that as soon as her arms became sufficiently relaxed, her hands should be kept in a basin of cold water, and the passes continued; adding that under this process she would awake in twenty-five minutes, although it would require a much longer time for her to recover

from what he described as her 'rash attempt,' the effects of which upon her brain and nervous system he minutely and lucidly described.

"As soon as her hands could be placed in the water, several watches were observed, and the assigned twenty-five minutes curiously awaited by the spectators. Precisely at the end of this period, she awoke and spoke, her whole left side, however, which had first been attacked, still remaining perfectly paralyzed, not excepting even the left arm which had been so directed as to reach the basin of water. To remove this state of paralysis, the writer found it necessary to resort to the Magnetic Machine. It was used three times a day, and on the third day the paralysis disappeared, and she was able to return to her home."

PSYCHOLOGY.

But it is more particularly what is called *psychology*, that presents the greatest and most fearful power; in which, without closing the physical senses, the mind is enchained and controlled in perfect accordance with the will of the operator. We here subjoin some account of it:—

In the winter of 1848–9, a great excitement was produced in this city, (Philadelphia,) by Dr. J. Bovee Dodds and Mr. Fisk, on what they then called the new science of Psychology. Mr. Fisk became professor of the science, formed extensive classes, to whom he was to impart a knowledge of the mystery for ten dollars each; they being bound not to divulge the secret under one year. The public exhibitions which he gave were thronged, and his experiments were most convincing to the majority, of the reality of his power. That he did what he professed, there is no reason to doubt. The deception and imposition consisted in the assumption that it was a new science, when in fact it was no more than had been long known and practised under the name of Neurology by Dr. Buchanan, Pathetism by La Roy Sunderland, and Credence Induction by Prof. J. S. Grimes. The phenomena are produced without inducing the magnetic sleep, and while the subject to all appearance is in his natural state, but is in fact bewitched. It is, however, only an offspring of mesmerism, and is accomplished by much the same means as the magnetic sleep.

Professor Grimes, in his *Philosophy of Mesmerism and Phrenology*, published in 1845, gives the following—

RULES FOR EXPERIMENTS.

“1. Tell the subject you intend to operate upon him, and get his consent to it.

2. Tell him that you are actually operating on him.

3. Perform some ceremonies which he supposes are essential to the success of the operation.

4. Be serious, firm, and *kind*, and assume a manner which prevents trifling, either on the part of the subject, or the persons who may be present.

5. If the subject has any reluctance to submit to the operation, excuse him at once; do not persuade him as if it is to do you a favour. Say but little to him except what is useful to the success of the operation.

6. If the subject has a guardian, you had better not operate unless the guardian or *loco parentis* requests it, and during the operation, if any friends be alarmed, or begin to dictate, it is better to restore the subject, and decline to operate upon him more; but while you do operate, allow of no superior. A commanding imperativeness and firmness is as important in the operator, as conformity is in the subject. The operator should for the time be perfectly “master of his subject,” and of every one else who is present, so far as to require order, and a conformity to regulations; but the operator should in no case lose his temper, or manifest any irritability; his motto should be, “mildly but firmly.”

7. Let the subject sit down in a common chair, without resting his head. Let him incline his head slightly forward, close his eyes, and keep them gently closed. Let him not speak, nor move, unless it is necessary to his comfort. Let him not cross his legs, as it will interrupt the circulation.

8. Sit down before him and take hold of his hands in any way you please, provided it conveys to the subject the impression that you are making an effort to affect him, and that your taking hold is a useful part of the operation.

9. You may sit thus before some persons an hour, without perceiving any effect whatever, and afterwards succeed; but, as a general rule, more than fifteen minutes is a waste of time. The first symptoms which subjects exhibit, are various, and often depend upon their fancy, their previous knowledge or reading, or what they have *heard* is the first effect. But there are some symptoms which are evidently involuntary—one is a slight tremor, which sometimes, though rarely, is increased to

convulsive twitchings. If the convulsions become alarming, the operator should never lose his coolness and self-command under any circumstances, but rouse the subject and restore him. I have never had but two such cases, and both were caused by previous nervous disease. Another common and favourable symptom is the breaking out of perspiration, which is of course involuntary. Another symptom is that when the operator places his hands upon the top of the head and passes them down to the shoulders, the subject breathes louder every time you do so. In some cases none of these symptoms are exhibited, and yet the subject is perfectly inducted in five minutes.

10. When you wish to ascertain whether you have succeeded in inducing the subject, press your fore-finger on the forehead where it joins the nose, or press one finger on one eye-brow, and another finger on the other brow, and, in a low voice, say to the subject, "*You cannot open your eyes,*" and if he is sufficiently affected, he cannot open them; he is not asleep, and, perhaps, he had no idea till this moment that he was in any degree affected. Now tell him to open his eyes and to put his hands together; lay your finger across them, and say, "*You cannot get your hands apart,*" and he cannot; or, perhaps, he can with a great effort. Now tell him to extend his arm, and when he has done so, tell him that he cannot put it down, and he cannot. If he is well inducted, you may tell him that he cannot step, or speak, or see, or hear, or taste, and he cannot do it. Tell him that water is rum, or ink, or hot, or cold. Tell him that black is white, that he cannot lift a feather, or a penny, and it will seem so to him. Tell him that a cent is gold, or silver, and he will receive it as such, and give you the change. Tell him that he is a negro, a female, a dog, a fish, a post, a steam-engine—that his head is a coffee-mill—that he is Richard, Hamlet, Jackson, Clay, or what you please, and he is transformed instantly, and verily believes your assertion to be true. Tell him that he can walk until he gets to such a line, but cannot pass over it, and he cannot.

11. If any other person besides the operator makes the assertion, it has no effect; but if the operator says to the subject, "such a person has influence over you," then the person or persons mentioned can influence the subject in the same manner.

12. There is considerable difference in subjects in respect to how far the delusion can be carried—some cannot open their eyes, or step, or move any muscle, yet they cannot be deceived.

concerning colours, or their own identity; some can only be deluded in one way, and some can in all ways.

13. The influence will pass off from some subjects within five minutes, and cannot be regained; but in most cases it continues several hours, and in many cases several days. I have made them stop in the street, a week after induction, by a single word.

14. A large majority of those persons who have ever been inducted or mesmerized in the usual way, can be made to perform these experiments when perfectly awake, and when no one would suppose from their appearance that they were in any degree affected or under any peculiar influence. Five minutes are enough to induct them sufficiently for this purpose."

From this it will be seen that the subject can be made to believe or do almost any thing the operator desires or wills. The foregoing is not an over-wrought picture of this power. It will be asked, how is it done? We reply, by taking possession of and controlling the will of the subject. We once asked the subject of an experiment, "Can you not let down your arm?" "Why, yes, it seems as though I could." "Then why do you not do it: I wish to see you do it." "Well, I do not see why I cannot, but I have no will." And thus with various other experiments that were made, the constant answer was, "It seems as though I could, but I have no will to do it." As in mesmeric experiments, so in these, the first requisition is submission to the will of the operator, and he has that will in keeping. All can readily see, that with susceptible persons there is great danger of deception and ruin.

But we give one more extract from Prof. Grimes on this point, which will set the subject in its true light:—

ABUSES OF ETHEROPATHY.

"The abuses of Etheropathy have been few as yet, but I feel bound to warn the unwary of the dangers to which they *may* be exposed.

I have had many subjects, who, when to all appearance perfectly awake, would believe that a piece of blank paper was a bank note of any denomination which I asserted it to be. At Saratoga Spa, in the presence of Judge Marvin and many other gentlemen, I made a young man, of excellent character, take worthless waste paper for bank notes, and give me a written obligation for a large amount of money which he supposed he had received. Suppose him to be the cashier of a bank, would

not this be a dangerous power in the hands of a dishonest man? Or suppose him to be worth a large amount of property in real estate—he might be made to transfer it by deed, in the presence of witnesses, while he was under this influence, and the witnesses not suspect that he was in a state different from usual. The witnesses would go into court and swear that he seemed perfectly rational and master of himself, and yet he would be in such a condition that he could not perceive any thing to be different from what it was asserted to be by the operator. Black would look white, if the operator declared it to be so. Copper would look, and feel, and sound like gold, if the operator affirmed it. In a word, the subject, and all his property, and other legal rights would be at the mercy of the operator. He could be made to sign any thing—a deed, or marriage contract, a confession of murder, or any thing else.

Others can judge as well as I how far this power will in future be abused; but I perform my duty in giving a warning to susceptible subjects. Let them not lightly disregard it. They should know that when once *thoroughly* inducted by one person they can *easily* be inducted by *any* person who is *permitted* to attempt it. They should know that they may be made to perform very improper actions without being aware of it, and without afterwards recollecting it. They should know that they may be made to commit actions which, in the eye of the law, are criminal, without really intending to do any wrong whatever. A woman may be made to believe that the operator is her father, or brother, or sister, or husband, and she will act accordingly; and afterwards she will have no recollection, excepting such as the operator pleases. It is my opinion, founded upon experiment, that one person in twenty is susceptible of this peculiar influence.

It may be said that this is dangerous knowledge, and had better not be communicated publicly. I confess that it would be safer if it could be confined to the medical profession; but this is impossible. It will necessarily be known to a sufficient number to render the knowledge dangerous. Nothing can prevent unprincipled and dishonest persons from gradually learning to avail themselves of this power to the injury of the unsuspecting. The only remedy is to let the public know at once the real nature of the power which the operator wills, and then every one will be upon his guard.

In some European countries, laws have been enacted forbidding any person to practise Etheropathy, excepting regular mæ-

dical professors or physicians, and I would respectfully recommend some such enactment in this country, to protect the innocent from the consequences of their own ignorance and the arts of accomplished knaves.

I would also suggest the propriety of a law rendering any contract voidable which is made by an operator with a subject, except when sanctioned by a physician in the presence of a magistrate."

~~~~~

## MYSTERIOUS KNOCKINGS.

Since our last No. went to press, we have received intelligence of the continued spread of those mysterious spiritual manifestations which commenced in western New York. We learn that there are about one hundred and fifty or two hundred different places where they have manifested themselves. Some of these manifestations are too marvellous to relate, and yet are stated on the most reliable authority. Rev. Mr. Phelps, a Presbyterian clergyman, of Stratford, Ct., whose house has for many months been the scene of these strange manifestations, has written a statement which has been published in the secular papers of the country, confirming the facts which had been before stated, but does not enter into a detail of what did actually take place.

Another account from St. Bartholomew, West Indies, presents strange marvels; but not more strange than has taken place in this city. Indeed, a circumstance which transpired in this city about a year and a half since, exceeds every thing we have ever heard or read on the subject: the transactions were too singular for publication, but yet are related upon the most credible authority.

*La Roy Sunderland* has also visited our city, and given a lecture on the subject, in which he related an interview with some of his deceased friends, a sister and two children, by which he became fully convinced of the reality of these spiritual communications, that they are truly from departed spirits. He, like us, however, is satisfied that their testimony is not to be relied upon.

But we differ on another point, and that is the propriety of consulting them. He maintains it to be a legitimate source of knowledge, and that the restrictions of the divine law do not lie



against the practice at this day, while we can but regard it as a positive prohibition to us as well as the old Israelites. If we wish to know the mysteries of the future, the scriptures of truth are open before us, and give a full assurance of a future state of rewards and punishments; and their testimony can be relied on with the fullest confidence: while these demons are not to be relied upon at all in what they say. We do not appeal to them or their testimony to prove any doctrine; but to the fact of their existence, and doings and sayings, as illustrative of the testimony of the Bible in reference to them.

ANOTHER DEVELOPMENT of the teaching of these demons, is a pamphlet of over a hundred pages, professing to be an exposition of various scriptures, by the spirits of Paul, John, Peter, Timothy, &c., &c., among the writers of the New Testament. Each of them in turn announces his name, and calls for the reading of such a chapter from his writings, and when it has been read, he proceeds verse by verse to expound it. A more contemptible mass of twaddle was never palmed off upon the public, than the work contains. But yet it finds its adherents and advocates, who give heed to these seducing spirits and teachings of demons.

## INSPIRATION OF FALSE PROPHETS.

The Old Testament scriptures record the existence of false prophets, and the work they performed. It is generally supposed they prophesied at random without any particular inspiration. But a careful examination will show the contrary. They were inspired, and believed that inspiration to be of God; but they were deceived with regard to the influence which was on them.

Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joined affinity with Ahab, king of Israel. Ahab proposed to Jehoshaphat to go up to Ramoth-Gilead to battle. But before going, the king of Judah requested Ahab to inquire of the Lord. He accordingly called together four hundred prophets. They said, "Go up, and prosper; for God will deliver it into thy hands." One of them, Zedekiah, made horns of iron, and said, "Thus saith the Lord, With these thou shalt push Israel till they be consumed." At last, Micaiah was called, and being adjured he said, "I did see Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep having no shepherd. And

the Lord said, 'These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace. Again, he said, "I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the hosts of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one spake, saying after this manner, and another saying after that manner. Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail: go out, and do even so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against thee. Then Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, came near, and smote Micaiah upon the cheek, and said, Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee? And Micaiah said, Behold, thou shalt see on that day when thou shalt go into an inner chamber to hide thyself." It is evident from Zedekiah's remarks that he and his fellows believed themselves inspired of God; but it was a lying spirit, sent forth as a judgment from God to deceive that wicked king, that he might go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead.

A damsel, in the days of Paul, followed him and his associates, saying, "These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show unto us the way of salvation." She had a spirit of divination; that is, a spirit that told fortunes, described the past, and predicted the future. She was a prophetess, and was inspired by a spirit to utter her oracles. After continuing to do this many days, "Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her. And he came out the same hour." Acts xvi. 18. "There were," says Peter, "false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who shall privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and shall bring upon themselves swift destruction." These are the successors of the false prophets, and by Christ, Matt. xxiv. and John, 1st Epistle, are called false prophets. Thus, "Believe not every spirit; but try the spirits whether they be of God," &c.; "for many false prophets are gone out into the world." Were it not for the profession of inspiration, no prophet could make any advancement. They are and will be under the influence of the demoniacal spirits. They must and will tell some truths with a great deal of falsehood. We should, therefore, "try the spirits."

A THRILLING NARRATIVE OF THE FACTS  
RELATING TO THE DIXBORO GHOST,

*Which lately appeared, at nine different times, in the village of Dixboro, Washtenaw county, Michigan;—as shown by the Affidavit of an unimpeachable Witness, who saw and conversed with the disembodied Spirit.*

The following extraordinary appearance was first related to us in October, 1848, by a gentleman who was in that part of the country where the events transpired: we subsequently received the account from a lady from Michigan. The narrative needs no comment, it speaks for itself. We have been informed that the two gentlemen implicated commenced a suit against Mr. Van Woert for a libel; but with what success we do not know. We also omit the history of the widow referred to, who was supposed to have been murdered by her brother-in-law.

“Mr. Van Woert is a man, worthy and respectable, and a member of the Methodist Church, of good standing, and according to several eminent phrenologists who have examined his phrenological developments, would be disposed rather to doubt, than to give credence to every passing report. Marvellousness small, with a temperament rather inclining to the bilious. He is a nephew of the illustrious Van Woert, of revolutionary memory, and has numerous testimonials of his general character for probity and veracity, previous to his emigration to this state.

“DEPOSITION OF MR. VAN WOERT.

“I, *Isaac Van Woert*, left Livingston county, New York, about the middle of September, 1845, for the purpose of moving to Michigan with my family, and I arrived on Wednesday, the 24th day of September, and took lodgings the same night in a vacant house, pointed out to me by Jackson Hawkins.

“On Saturday, the 27th day of September, between seven and eight o'clock, I was standing in front of said house, my wife had stepped into Mrs. Hammond's, about two rods distant, my two little boys were in the back yard, for I had just passed through the house and was combing my hair, when I saw a light through the window; I put my hand on the window sill, and looked in; saw a woman with a candlestick in her hand, in which was a candle burning. She held it in her left hand; she was a middling size woman, wore a loose gown, had a white cloth around her head, her right hand was clasped in her clothes near the waist; she was a little bent forward, her eye large and much sunken, very pale indeed; her lips projected,

and her teeth showed some. She moved slowly across the floor until she entered the bedroom, and the door closed. I then went up and opened the bedroom door, and all was dark; I stepped forward and lighted a candle with a match, but saw no one, or heard any noise, except just before I opened the bedroom door, I thought I heard one of the bureau drawers open and shut.

"I spoke of what I had seen several days after, and then learned, for the first time, that the house in which I then lived, had been previously occupied by Widow M——, and that she died there.

"The second time I saw her was in October, about one o'clock in the morning. I got up, started to go out of the back door; as I opened the bedroom door, it was light in the outer room; *I saw no candle!* but I saw the same woman that I saw before; I was about five feet from her; she said, 'Don't touch me—touch me not.' I stepped back a little, and asked her what she wanted, she said, 'He has got it. He robbed me little by little, until they kilt me! They kilt me, and now he has got it all.' I then asked her, Who had it all? She said, 'J——, J——, yes, J—— has got it at last, but it won't do him long. Joseph! O Joseph! I wish Joseph would come away.' And then all was dark and still.

"*October.*—The third time I saw her, I awoke in the night; know not what hour; the bedroom was entirely light; I saw no candle—but saw the same woman—she said, 'J—— can't hurt me any more. No, he can't—I am out of his reach. Why don't they get Joseph away? Oh! my boy! Why not come away.' And all was dark and still.

"*October.*—The fourth time I saw her was about eleven o'clock at night. I was sitting with my feet on the stove hearth. My family had retired, and I was eating a lunch, when all at once the door stood open, and I saw the same woman in the door, supported in the arms of a man whom I knew. She was stretched back, and looked as if she was in the agonies of death; she said nothing, but the man said, 'She is dying—she will die,' &c., and all disappeared, and the door closed without noise.

"*October.*—The fifth time I saw her was a little past sunrise, I came out of the house to my work. I saw the same woman in the front yard, she said, 'I wanted Joseph to keep my papers, but they are ——' Here something seemed to stop her utterance. She then said, 'Joseph, Joseph! I fear something will befall my boy,' then all was gone.

"*October.*—The sixth time I saw her was near midnight, it



was the same woman standing in the bedroom. The room was again light as before; no candle visible. I looked at my wife, fearing she might awake. She then raised her hand, and said, 'She will not awake;' she seemed to be in great pain; she then leaned over, grasped her bowels in one hand, and in the other held a phial containing a liquid. I asked her what it was. 'The doctor said it was Balm of Gilead,' she replied, and all disappeared.

"*October.*—The seventh time I saw her I was working at a little bench, which was standing in the room, at which I work on evenings—I saw the same woman. 'I wanted to tell James something, but I could not.' I asked what she wanted to tell. 'Oh! he did an awful thing to me.' I asked her who did. 'The man they would not let me have,' she answered. I asked her what he did. 'O, he gave me a great deal of trouble in my mind,' she replied. 'Oh! they kilt me.' She repeated this several times over. I walked forward and tried to reach her, but she kept the same distance from me. I asked her if she had taken any thing that had killed her; she answered, 'Oh, I don't! Oh, I don't!' the froth in her mouth seemed to stop her utterance. Then she said, 'Oh, they kilt me, they kilt me!' this she repeated a number of times. I asked her, 'Who killed you?' 'I will show you,' she said. Then she went out of the back door near the fence, and I followed her. There I saw two men, whom I knew, standing. They looked cast down and dejected. I saw them begin at their feet and melt down, like lead melting, until they were entirely melted; and then a blue blaze, two inches thick, burned over the surface of the melted mass; then all began bubbling up like lime slacking. I turned to see where the woman was, but she was gone—I looked back again and all was gone and dark.

"The next time I saw the woman was in the back yard, about five o'clock, P. M. She said, 'I want you to tell J—— to repent. Oh, if he would repent. But he won't, he won't, he can't. John was a bad man;' and muttered something I could not understand. She then said, 'Do you know where Frain's lake is?' She then asked another question of much importance, and said, 'Don't tell of that.'

"I asked her if I should inform the public of the two men that had killed her. She replied, 'There will be a time—the time is coming—the time will come,' &c., several times, 'But oh, their end! their end! their wicked end!' and she muttered something about Joseph, and all was dark.

"The next time I saw her was on the sixth of November, about midnight, in the bedroom. She was dressed in white; her hands hung down by her side, stood very straight, and looked very pale, she said, 'I don't want any body here—I want nobody here;' and muttered over something I did not understand, except now and then the word 'Joseph.' She then said, 'I wanted to tell a secret, and I thought I had.'

"In all her conversation, she used the Irish accent. Intermixed in all her conversation, was the expression very often repeated, 'They have kilt me! oh, they have kilt me!' and also the name of 'Joseph.'

"Sworn and subscribed to, before me, at my office in Ann Arbor, December 8th, 1845.

WILLIAM R. PERRY.

"When Mr. Van Woert first related the extraordinary fact of his having seen the deceased, to some of his neighbours, as appears from his affidavit, he was ignorant of any person having died in the house in which he resided; yet from his description, those who had been acquainted with Widow —, immediately recognised her, as being the only person in the place who could answer the description. Many of those who had been most intimately acquainted with her, assert that had they been called upon to describe her, it would have been impossible to have done it with more truth and accuracy. At her second visit, she expressed great anxiety for her son Joseph, as if fearing, lest he should suffer some violence from those whom she asserts had '*kilt*' her. It will be remembered that Joseph was a son by her first husband, and probably for this reason she feared that justice might not be done him.

"At her fourth appearance, she was in the door supported by a man whom he knew. This scene, as it appears from the admission (since denied) of Mr. —, had actually occurred the night previous to her decease, and was further admitted, that no living person but himself could have told it to Van Woert, as it was in the night when it happened, and no other person had been witness to it. It seems that on that night she was at the house of one of her neighbours, not far distant from her own, and in a state of delirium had left the house, followed by her brother-in-law, who overtook her just as she reached her own, where she fell back, and he caught her in his arms, and supposing that she was dying, he cried out in the words given in the affidavit, to alarm those who were sleeping in the house, but did not immediately succeed in waking any one.

“Whatever credit we may feel disposed to give to these strange occurrences, it is certain, that those living in the immediate vicinity have thought them worthy some consideration, and were so far convinced of their credibility, as to have the body disinterred, and the stomach examined by a committee of eminent physicians, and although no effects of mineral poison were detected, yet from other circumstances it appeared that she had died from poison.

“Thus we have given, as far as circumstances would permit, a true statement of the most interesting facts connected with this wonderful supernatural development; and leave the reader to ruminate and digest as may best please the taste.”

---

### RECAPITULATION.

As the present No. completes a half volume, we will briefly recapitulate the ground over which we have passed.

Our main object has been to prove from scripture and matter of fact, that man possesses a spirit which survives, in a state of consciousness, the death of the body. In establishing this point we have *proved* from scripture, 1st, That *consciousness and intelligence* are attributes of spirits; that spirits are not dependent on a physical organization for the possession and exercise of these attributes. Proof—“God is a spirit;” yet he possesses them. “He maketh his angels spirits;” yet they possess them. Demons are spirits, called “foul spirits,” “deaf and dumb spirits,” “unclean spirits,” &c. And they also possess these attributes.

2. If God, angels, and demons, are spirits, possessed of consciousness and intelligence, other spirits may also be. But man, according to the scriptures, has a spirit, a distinct principle from and formed after his physical structure, which was made of dust; a spirit which was formed within him. Zech. xii. 1. That spirit, according to Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 11, is the intelligent agent in man, and knows the things of a man, as the spirit of God does the things of God. And according to the wise man, Eccl. xii. 7, at death, when the dust returns to dust, the spirit returns to God. Thus the distinction is constantly kept up between the body and spirit, as to its origin, nature, and destiny at death. Paul teaches that the spirits of just men made perfect are in the *heavenly Jerusalem*. Heb. xii. 22. Peter teaches that the spirits of the disobedient antediluvians

were in prison; and that the dead as well as quick shall give account to their judge; and that, in order to this, they live according to (or like) God in spirit. 1 Pet. iii., iv. Christ teaches that the rich man died, and was buried. Thus his body was dead, for the body without the spirit is dead; and hence must be in a state of unconsciousness. But "in hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." That torment must, therefore, have been of the spirit, which lives, according to God, after death.

3. We have proved the spirit of man to be capable of leaving the body in trance before death, and to be conscious of the fact, and of what it saw and heard, as in the case of St. John on several occasions, in which he says he was in spirit, and saw and heard. Also in a well authenticated case of Mrs. Goffe, in England. (See page 30.)

4. We have proved from the recorded appearance of Samuel and Moses after death, that spirits can and do return and manifest themselves on earth, and communicate with men. We have also given well attested records of the visible open appearance of the departed, who have announced their names and shown their persons, as well as declared their identity to those who in life knew them, and related facts, past, existing, and future, before unknown, and which could only be known by such communication, thus proving the reality of their appearance and truth of their sayings. (See p. 30.) We could produce any number of facts of the kind, as well authenticated by reliable eye and ear witnesses as any facts of history extant.

5. We have presented an argument on the subject of Demonology, from the pen of another, which we regard as an unanswerable demonstration that the demons of the Bible are departed spirits.

6. We have appealed to the facts of mesmerism and clairvoyance in proof of the existence of a spirit capable of consciousness and intelligence out of the body, and have presented the testimony of a reliable witness as to his consciousness in his subsequent natural state, that he was absent, and did see with his spiritual eyes as he does with his natural. Any amount of testimony of this kind could be produced.

7. We have made our appeal to the "mysterious knockings" and communications, in proof of the existence of departed spirits, and of their power and intelligence.

We regard the evidence of man's conscious existence after death as triumphantly established. Let the importance and force of these points be duly weighed.



## STARTLING DEVELOPMENTS OF THE PROGRESS OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM, ESPECIALLY IN ENGLAND.

The great crisis through which Great Britain is at this time passing, cannot but interest every Protestant heart. So far as outward support is concerned, England has constituted the grand bulwark of Protestantism. This Rome well knew, and hence her deep anxiety for the reconversion of England to Popery; and hence, also, the deep sensation of all Protestant sects in Great Britain, in view of the recent attempts to establish the Roman Catholic hierarchy in that country.

We shall present our readers with a condensed sketch of the progress of Popery in England for the last 36 years.

In A. D. 1559, the emancipation of England from Popery was consummated by the united voice of her sovereign and her three estates. All monastic orders were suppressed, the Jesuits banished; political and civil disabilities were imposed on all who professed the Roman Catholic faith.

In 1814, there were in all England 44 Roman Catholic chapels, and all their disabilities still remained. At the end of 16 years, in 1830, the number of chapels had increased to 497, exclusive of all the abbeys, monasteries, nunneries, and seminaries which were established in the same period.

In 1829, the Catholic emancipation act passed the British parliament, giving to Roman Catholics a seat in parliament, and other civil and political privileges. The following extract from the London Times of Nov. 26, 1850, will give a view of the position of Catholics under that act.

“Judging from the interpretation which has been sought to be forced upon the emancipation act, we cannot doubt that had the present aggression been allowed to pass unrebuked, a totally new principle would have been established. The emancipation act gave to the Roman Catholic laity, as individuals, freedom for their speculative

belief; but the prohibition against carrying those theories into practice, clearly implied in the oath, withheld from them that freedom in their collective capacity. They might believe what they would, without weakening or disturbing the Protestant religion; they could not embody that belief in the form of a local and titled hierarchy without doing both. The emancipation act permitted individuals to give spiritual allegiance to a foreign power; it is sought to found on that permission the right to organize a conspiracy against the constitution. If that right be conceded, what other can we refuse?"

"The hierarchy" of the church of Rome, as established in England, consists of a regular gradation of Ecclesiastical dignitaries, from Archbishop downward, so that all orders of the clergy may be ordained in England, without going to any foreign country for the ordination of bishops, as they have formerly done. Cardinal Wiseman thus explains the affair. "It is impossible that the Catholic church in England *can* be governed otherwise than by bishops; these bishops must have a metropolitan, and that metropolitan (archbishop) *must* take a title from some district in the capital."

According to the British constitution, it is the prerogative of the monarch alone to constitute see, bishoprics, and archbishoprics in England. And this division of England into twelve bishoprics and an archbishopric is regarded by the English people as an infraction of the constitution and an invasion of the rights and prerogatives of the Queen.

During the last twenty years, or since the passage of the emancipation act, the growth of Catholicism has been almost inconceivable in England and Scotland. The English themselves are disposed to attribute its rapid increase as well as its present arrogance to the existence of Puseyism in the established church. And there can be no reasonable doubt, but that such is to a considerable extent the fact; but still there are other causes at work, which lie back of Puseyism. Whence originated Puseyism? We reply, "While men slept, the enemy came, and sowed

tores among the wheat, and went his way." Jesuitism had been in Oxford before Tractarianism was developed.

The entire Catholic world is bent on the conversion of England to Popery; and they leave no measure untried to accomplish the work.

An extract from "*A statement of facts*," &c., shows the energy being put forth for that purpose. Hon. and Rev. G. Spencer, in Dec. 1838, made the following statement at a public dinner.

"What I have witnessed in France, and am now about to state to you, has exceedingly delighted me, as calculated, I trust, to animate all the Catholics of England to hope for her conversion, and by that hope to be excited with firm and persevering zeal to work for it. You remember, my friends, that it was under gloomy circumstances I had to leave you. I felt as one exiled when I was sent away to recruit my health; but I determined to acquiesce in the will of God, and it always answers well to trust ourselves in his hands. I have gained more for you, I trust, by my absence, than by all I could have done among you. I had no idea when I went to Paris in what the two weeks of my stay there were to be employed. This was determined by the conversation which took place when, on the first evening of my arrival, I was presented to the archbishop. While I was with him the conversation turned, as might be expected, on the state of religion in England; and I said, what I always say, that the prayers of the faithful are what we must mainly depend on for success, and that it would be of immense benefit if the Catholics of France would unite in praying for us. I spoke thus, not to the archbishop himself, but to the grand vicar, and without an idea of making a distinct proposal for such an association as was afterwards established. The grand vicar, however, at once made me speak to the archbishop, who took up the suggestion with an earnestness and charity which surprised and delighted me. He was to receive, two days after, an address from sixty or eighty of the clergy of Paris. He appointed me to meet him in their presence. After the affair for which they were assembled

was concluded, he presented me to them, explaining the cause of my appearance, and concluded by himself requesting that they should undertake to pray for the conversion of England, and that the Thursday of every week should be the day peculiarly assigned for this object. (Cheers.) They all accepted the proposal with great alacrity. A few days after, I was told by a priest whom I met, that, though not present at this meeting, he had heard of the archbishop's wish, and that he and twelve others, priests, who lived together in community in one house, had all offered mass for this purpose on the first Thursday which had occurred. You may conceive how this encouraged me in my proceedings. I accordingly obtained from the grand vicar a circular of introduction to the superiors of religious houses in Paris, and visited about twenty of the principal. They all undertook to make the conversion of England the special object of their prayers every Thursday—(cheers)—and to recommend the same practice to all their sister houses through France. The general order of the Lazarists, the provincial of the Jesuits, undertook to recommend it to all their brethren. (Much applause.) I met, besides, several other distinguished prelates in Paris, who all hailed with extreme joy the thought of England returning to the faith, and promised to recommend the holy work of praying for her to all their subjects. I was every where assured that I should have all France united with us. (Hear.) Do you think, said they, we can refuse our prayers for that country which once was the island of saints, and we trust will be so soon again? You would be delighted to hear me read to you the letters which I have received from several quarters, in answer to my subsequent applications. I cannot refuse myself the pleasure of giving you an extract from that written to me by the Bishop of Amiens.—‘Sir,’ he says, ‘I associate myself with my whole heart to your holy enterprise. Bossuet used every day to implore of God that this island of saints, this highly gifted England, might return to the faith of St. Augustine, her first apostle. So many holy martyrs as that church has produced, so many



holy and noble families as have in that country kept the faith at the cost of their political existence—so many holy French priests as have there found such generous hospitality—the prayers of former days, the prayers now recently inspired by religious gratitude, all make me believe that this great and noble nation will once more find the road in which her fathers walked. I will embrace every occasion to recommend to my clergy so good a work, in which I feel myself peculiarly interested; and I thank you, Sir, for having given me this good opportunity of expressing my sentiments upon it. Like these were the terms of ardent charity in which all those holy people spoke of our country. And now I must tell you with what honour I was received, as the agent of this undertaking, on my return to Dieppe, where my friend Mr. Phillips and I had established ourselves for the two months we were to spend together in France. It does not become me to rejoice in receiving honours, nor to speak of them myself; but these honours I delight in, as tokens of the warm-hearted attachment of those good people to this great cause. The same day that I had related my proceedings to the priest of the principal church in the town, he spoke in our behalf most eloquently to his flock, and the next Sunday he requested me to give a solemn benediction in the church, and to preach in French to the congregation, who, though I spoke with the accents and expression of foreigners, received my address with extraordinary kindness. To show you further the interest which this object has excited in France, I have to tell you that the Archbishop of Paris, and the rest who had supported it, saw fit that 6000 copies of this discourse, which I submitted to their judgment, should be printed and distributed through France, so that every bishop and priest of the kingdom should be thus distinctly solicited to enter the association; and the work will not be confined to France. I saw enough to convince me, while there, that ere long all the nations of Europe will be joined in one great society of prayer for the conversion of this kingdom. (Applause.)

The *Church and State Gazette* publishes the following

copy of the prayer composed by the Hon. and Rev. G. Spencer:—

“PRAYER FOR THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.

“Almighty God! Father of Mercy! thou who hast determined to save men by faith, cast a propitious glance upon the kingdom of England. Disperse the darkness which heresy has spread there, and there make the torch of truth gleam in the eyes of her children, so that all may joyfully return into the bosom of our mother, the holy Church, through our Lord Jesus Christ. So be it.

“Holy Virgin, Mother of God, pray for England!

“St. Peter and St. Paul, pray for her!

“St. Gregory, the Pope, and St. Augustine, the Apostle of England, pray for her!

“St. Thomas of Canterbury, holy Martyrs, and holy Confessors of England, pray for her!

“Holy virgins and widows of England, pray for her.

“Deign to be moved, O Lord, by the prayers of your friends (*sic.*) Deliver your people; bless your heritage; and save those souls redeemed at the cost of the precious blood of your Divine Son, who liveth and reigneth with you for ever and ever. So be it.

“APPROVAL.

“We give our sanction to the above prayer; and, for every day on which it shall be devoutly repeated, we hereby grant a hundred days’ indulgence (from the pains of purgatory.) We accord the same favour to those who shall receive the Holy Communion, as well as to the priests who may celebrate Mass with the like views (of bringing about the conversion of England.)

“We earnestly engage all who are of our diocese, and especially the priesthood, and the members of religious societies, to be frequent in prayer for an object so important, and to especially dedicate the Thursday to this work.

“(Signed)      ENGLEBERT,  
“Cardinal Archbishop of Malines.

“*Malines*, 1844.”

IRISH SERVANT GIRLS EMPLOYED TO CONVERT ENGLAND TO  
POPERY.

This same Hon. and Reverend gentleman is still, at the end of 12 years, pursuing his favourite work. The following item cut from a recent No. of the Philadelphia Daily Sun, will be of interest.

FEMALE JESUITS.—We frequently find advertisements for nursery, chambermaids, &c., who must be Protestants —“none others need apply.” This exclusion of Roman Catholics may seem to involve a degree of bigotry and a want of liberality and toleration, but a correspondent of the *Journal of Commerce* directs attention to a recent development which shows that this distinction is of more importance than would at first be supposed. The *Free-man's Journal* of the 23d ultimo, contains a report of a lecture delivered by the “Hon. and Rev. George Spencer” —of an order of the Priesthood called “Passionists” —in the town of Derry in Ireland. It appears that this Honourable Divine has embarked in a crusade for the conversion of England to the faith of the Church of Rome, and that he was delivering lectures throughout Ireland for the purpose of pointing out the means and stimulating his hearers to join him in the work. Among the means recommended and urged, we find the following:—The Irish girls, on going to England, are to keep up an intimate connexion with the Priests there, and to “enter a Protestant family with the fixed determination of converting that family in three years, and then going to another for the same purpose.”

“For instance,” continues the Reverend Lecturer, “I would say to one of the right stamp—There is a nobleman’s family; enter it as scullery maid.” He did not say how she was to proceed; but we may suppose she would begin with the cook, or with the house maid, or rather, perhaps, with the nursery maid, and try to secure the children, both boys and girls, of the family, reporting progress from time to time to Father Spencer, or some other priest, and telling him all about the family. No doubt in this

way some noted conversions have been effected. "In this way (continued Mr. Spencer) the whole fabric of English society could be undermined, and the rotten foundations of Protestantism would give way by means of this holy conspiracy, of which, however, he would make no secret." This is only a part of the plan for the "conquest of England." The lecturer declared that "he came not unsent or unauthorized"—that "before he undertook it he got the sanction of Dr. Griffiths, the senior bishop of England,"—who sent a written statement of "his plan to each of the Irish bishops, all of whom gave their approval, decidedly." Various other means of accomplishing the object are advocated; but we desire to be brief and apropos, and would commend the entire lecture to your perusal. Inasmuch as we can see no reason to doubt that "Irish girls" are sent here on the same mission, it seems fair that the parties interested should be made acquainted with the danger.

It is proper to state that the report of the lecture is taken from the "*Derry Standard*," a Protestant paper, but not a word of doubt or denial accompanies its transfer to the "*Freeman's Journal*," whose vigilant editor would not be backward in announcing his dissent, if any existed.

#### CONVERSION OF ENGLAND TO POPERY BY FRANCISCAN MONKS.

In addition to the army of menial domestics made use of for the conversion of England, we have another plan developed in the following letter, published in the "*Journal of Brussels*," of July 21, 1850.

It seems, then, from reports, that it will not be long before we shall again see in England, for the first time since the Reformation, those holy Franciscan monks labouring, with all the zeal of their seraphic founder, in the conversion of our deluded English brethren. Their simplicity, their zeal, their authority, their ardent love to bring all souls to the full enjoyment of the children of God, must guaranty for them a happy reception and great success in



their labours. With all England's Protestantism, I believe, with sincerity and singleness of purpose for the well-being of others, however strange the appearance of these devoted monks may be, England is now sufficiently tolerant to admire rather than despise such Apostolic devotedness. England will have a noble example, in these holy monks, of the "*Voluntary Principle*" of Church and clerical support. Under a vow of absolute and perpetual poverty they dare not even (unless under very peculiar circumstances) touch money. All their aim is to preach Christ and Him crucified, and to draw all men into the bosom of Christ's Church. Like the Apostles, they go forth, without scrip or purse, and God is always faithful to them, and they are supplied for their necessary wants; more than that they ask not. Their raiment of the coarsest kind serves to clothe them alike by day and by night, for winter as for summer, and their pallet of straw is not too luxurious to prevent their rising at midnight to chant the praises of their Maker. They come not to dispute with their erring brethré. Like St. Paul, who was never heard to decry the Diana of the Ephesians, neither will they be found to multiply enemies by passionate disputes. All that they know is the religion of Christ and of His Church; that alone will they press upon the attention of all men in the spirit of love. They will not come to call the faithful only, but wandering children to repentance. Protestants it is that they wish to regain to the fold; and love and affection are powerful means.

People seldom like to be told of their faults. Preach to them the truth in all simplicity, and England is too wise to reject it; and not so bad, nor so overwhelmed with her love of worldly gain, or power, it is to be hoped, with the help of God's grace, as not to accept it.

Bristol is a happy city to be the first to open its arms to these Seraphic missionaries, and to welcome them back to the British shores. It was in the year 1260, during the reign of Henry III., that the Franciscans first visited England. Nine monks of this order then landed at Dover, five of whom went to Canterbury, where they es-

tablished the first monastery; the remaining four went to London, where their second monastery was erected at the expense of John Jewyn, a merchant in St. Nicholas' Shambles. The correctness of this date may be questioned after the Rev. Mr. Flanagan's quotation in his "Manual of British and Irish History," where he says that Roger Bacon, a native of Ilchester, the famous author of "*Opus Majus*," a work dedicated to Pope Clement IV., and who acquired the appellation of the "*Admirable Doctor*," became a Franciscan friar in 1240. This is nearly 20 years before the arrival of the Franciscans in England. It might have been that Roger Bacon went and entered the order in some monastery on the Continent, and that he was one of the first nine alluded to above who visited England. Six hundred years have now nearly passed away, and the Franciscans, with all the persecution and suppression of the Reformers, still exist in all their simplicity, and poverty, and devotedness for the extension of the knowledge of the truth and the blessing of true Christian Religion, even to the children of their suppressors and persecutors. Admirable illustration of the truth of the Catholic Faith, and of the spirit of its Divine Founder.

BERNARD ALPHONSUS,

Of the Third Order of St. Francis.

Monte Alyerne, Feast of St. Mary of the }  
Angels, called the Portioncule, 1850. }

#### APPOINTMENT OF CARDINAL WISEMAN ARCHBISHOP.

And then comes the Roman hierarchy to complete the work.

"*The London Catholic Standard*" has the following remarks on the subject of the appointment of Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster. It shows the glowing anticipations of the Catholics as to the result of the appointment, and the action which the coming Parliament will take in their favour.

## THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

As we anticipated some two months ago, Dr. Wiseman has been elevated to the Cardinalate under the above title, and may now be legitimately regarded as the head of the English hierarchy. The other changes cannot long remain a secret, when the leading diocese has thus been so prominently settled. Westminster was only a cloister for abbets and monks up to Henry VIII.'s day, who pillaged the saintly inhabitants and gave up their property to a reforming bishop and canons instead. Mary turned back to, and Elizabeth deflected the old Abbey from its original uses, but allowed the bishopric her father had founded to die out, and it has not been restored till the Roman consistory called it, the other day, into being, with the same fiat which restored the hierarchy of England, and conferred the Cardinalate upon one of her most gifted sons. Since the death of Cardinal Pole in 1558, his eminence will be the first of that dignity who has appeared in this country, and in announcing his return to take possession of his new See, in the middle of next month, we are only sorry that we cannot remove the beastly statues out of the venerable abbey, and make its fretted roof ring with the song which they have often re-echoed, in celebration of so joyous an event as the advent of a Cardinal Archbishop to our shores.

Lauda Sion Salvatorem  
Lauda ducem et pastorem  
In Hymnis et Canticis.

With regard to the permanency of Cardinal Wiseman's stay in England it is another matter. His holiness called him to Rome, in order to have his advice at hand, in cases of emergency, and to intrust him with some important function in the Pontific cabinet; but there is no doubt, that the Holy Father will forego his claims, out of consideration to the interesting state of English Catholicity, if the obstacles be removed which arise out of the political circumstances of the country. While the English government strangely refuses to put Rome on the same terms of

diplomatic intercourse as it allows the Rajah of Nepaul, and the Mufti of Constantinople, and retains upon its statute book the vilest laws against the leading sections of her religious militia, the purlieus of Westminster are no fit place for Catholic Princes. There is, however, no doubt, that this state of things will be altered next season. To do the Whigs justice, it must be said that they have strenuously endeavoured to rid the country of this ludicrous intolerance. The men who opposed them are fast going off: the Duke of Newcastle, who was their opponent on the last occasion, is either dead or dying, and the chances are, if the ministers push the measure in the early part of next session, that they will carry it by as great a majority in the lords as they formerly numbered in the commons. Seasonable opportunities are seldom let slip by ministers; and we are glad to announce that the New Diplomatic Relations Bill is one of the measures that will next year be submitted to the country. On the success of this ministerial effort, the Cardinal and Archbishop of Westminster's stay in the country will, we conjecture, very greatly depend.

The other creations of the consistory will be attended with most important benefits to the church, and tend greatly to promote the security of the Roman Government, by enlarging it to a European basis.

The sacred college for the last two centuries has been more or less obliged to confer its privileges upon Italian Prelates, as the more northern countries were either shaken by schism or overrun with heresy, but now that the horizon is clearing up, she seems very wisely disposed to place things on their ancient foundation. It is said that her restrictive policy went too far. Though France and Spain had taken no part in the Lutheran folly, their Cardinals were lessened and the vacant seats filled up by Italian Prelates. There were no doubt other, besides spiritual considerations, that moved the sacred college to take this step. Out of the venerable conclave was chosen the ruler of the Papal States as well as the Sovereign Pontiff, and it was unjust to the Italians, that a Foreign Cardinal should be able



to overpower those of their own nation in raising an alien to the throne. How far the selfish dogmas of the *Reformation* tended to produce this reaction it would be hard to say, but from that epoch it gathered strength until it Italianized the practical executive of the Church. More Cardinals were chosen out of the Pontific States than out of the entire Peninsula, and more Cardinals were appointed out of the Peninsula than out of all the other parts of the world put together. This, however, resulted from necessity rather than inclination: the church could not lavish her regal honours on the sons of rebellious nations, and she proves the sincerity of her motives, by removing the restrictions as soon as the Catholic revival among them ensures her confidence. Hence the consistory of the 30th September, in which ten foreign Cardinals were created over four Italian ones. There is no doubt that our august Pontiff will continue to pursue this enlightened policy as the Catholic heart of the northern hemisphere awakens, and fix his throne upon a basis as extensive as the spread of Catholicity will admit. There is no institution that has such effective machinery even for the world's government as the Catholic church, embracing as she does the most civilized countries in her religious dominion, and including in her schools the purest hearts and the best intellects of the nations over which she has spiritual authority. In this respect the world may be said to be at her feet.—*London Catholic Standard*.

#### FOURTEEN NEW CARDINALS APPOINTED.

The extract which follows is from the London Correspondent of the "Boston Pilot."

☞ A most interesting and important event in the history of the old world took place at Rome on Monday, Sept. 30th, when a consistory was held, and fourteen new Cardinals were created. Ten out of the number have been chosen from foreign States, a circumstance that has not happened in several centuries. It is said that the principle on which the selection has been made is the same that has guided Pius IX. in other instances. The Papacy is not

merely an Italian or European power, but it is universal, extending over the whole civilized world. It is remarked that for the first time in history the combined action of some of the principal nations in Europe has replaced the Pope on the oldest throne in the world, thus bringing out, as it were, the Papacy beyond an Italian state. Pius IX. has at the same time looked beyond Italy for counsellors, and called, to the honour of the people, a greater proportion of foreign Cardinals than former precedents in the last three centuries would have authorized. In doing so he has shown great foresight and judgment, and the act will have a tendency to strengthen his throne, and extend the influence of the Papacy. The following is a list of the new Cardinals—1. Cardinal Wiseman, with the title of Archbishop of Westminster. 2. Cardinal Geissel, Archbishop of Cologne. 3. Cardinal Pieperbrock, Prince Bishop of Breslau. 4. Cardinal Bondy, Archbishop of Toledo. 5. Cardinal Romeo, Archbishop of Seville. 6. Cardinal Fornari, Apostolical Nuncio at Paris. 7. Cardinal Gouset, Archbishop of Rheims. 8. Cardinal D'Astros, Archbishop of Toulouse. 9. Cardinal Mattieu, Archbishop of Besançon. 10. Cardinal Figueiredo, Primate Archbishop of Braza. 11. Cardinal Cosenza, Bishop of Andria. 12. Cardinal Vecchi, Bishop of Gubbio. 13. Cardinal Roberti, Uditore della Camera. 14. Cardinal Gof, Archbishop of Olmutz. The great ceremonies took place on Thursday, October 3d, when the new Cardinals took the oaths in the Sistine Chapel and received the red hat from the Pope. A secret consistory was afterwards held, when each Cardinal received a sapphire ring and a title. The Cardinals afterwards visited St. Peter's in state. In my next letter I will give you from private and public sources a complete account of all these important, interesting and imposing ceremonies. It is said that Cardinal Wiseman will receive the title of St. Pudentiana, and that he will shortly return to England to occupy his metropolitan See.

## CANON LAW IN ENGLAND.

THE DESIGNS OF ROME IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A  
HIERARCHY IN ENGLAND. READ AND PONDER.

We give below an extract from an editorial in the London Times of Nov. 26, which will throw light on the subject.

The most cursory reference to the grounds on which DR. WISEMAN informs us that the establishment of a regular Hierarchy in England was solicited from the Roman See, as he says, by the English Catholics, but as it would rather appear by the Vicars Apostolic, will show that both the objects we anticipated were steadily kept in view. We have to thank the candour of Dr. WISEMAN for showing us that other objects of a still more questionable nature were contemplated, and it does not require much penetration to see that the CARDINAL has not felt himself obliged to lay before our heretical eyes all the results which in his day-dreams of power and ambition he fondly anticipated. It is necessary, says DR. WISEMAN, in substance, that the canon law should be introduced into England. In order that it should be introduced, it is necessary that there should be a regular hierarchy, and in order to the constitution of a regular hierarchy, it is necessary for the Roman Catholic Bishops to take their titles from the names of the principal towns. With every respect for the high authority which promulgates them, we shall take leave to deny each and all of these propositions. It must seem strange that the Roman Catholics, who lived three hundred years under persecution, and twenty under toleration, without the canon law, should now for the first time awake to the necessity of its introduction. But without insisting on this, what is there in the canon law, considered as a system of morals and jurisprudence, which should make its introduction, in the eyes of the people of England, a sufficient excuse for the recent aggressions? What is this canon law, that we should so desire its introduction that, in order to obtain it, we ought to be content to waive for its sake our duty to the Church and our loyalty to the Crown?

The canon law, we hesitate not to say, is a complete system of persecution, falsehood, priest-craft and tyranny. The canon law inculcates that all baptized persons are within the jurisdiction of the Catholic and universal church, and that if they fall into heresy they may lawfully be punished with any requisite degree of severity. According to it, persecution is a duty, the performance of which nothing but weakness can excuse. The canon law teaches the lawfulness of equivocation and dissimulation, and the nullity of oaths, when contrary to the interests of the church. The canon law inculcates the dispensing power of the Popes, and the absolute subordination to them of all powers ecclesiastical and temporal. Almost every dogma which has been made a reproach to the Church of Rome, as inconsistent with the maintenance of civil government and social confidence, is to be found in this odious code.

There is no doubt that the promulgation by the pope of this code, framed by ecclesiastics for the purpose of perpetuating ecclesiastical domination over mankind, would materially increase the power of the Roman Catholic clergy over the laity. Instead of occupying a position similar to that of other dissenting teachers, instead of having to rely for their influence over their flocks on the fallible grounds of the weight of individual character or the force of individual intelligence, they will henceforth be able to appeal to an infallible law which settles by anticipation every question in their favour. The fixed rules by which DR. WISEMAN tells us the Roman Catholic clergy earnestly desire to be guarded from arbitrary decisions are rules which give to those arbitrary decisions the force of law; the uncertainty of position of the clergy which he deplors will be replaced under the canon law by a position perfectly certain and ascertained—a position which enslaves the laity to the clergy and the inferior priesthood to the superior. The introduction of this rigid discipline into the Roman Catholic body may be beneficial to the aspiring clergy, but cannot fail to be injurious to the laity, and through them to the rest of HER MAJESTY's subjects.

If the Roman Catholics of England are in every respect



advantageously distinguished from those of other countries where their religion is dominant, if with an amiable inconsistency they have learnt the practice of mutual toleration and the language of civil and religious liberty, we owe it mainly to this—that they have only heard of the canon law in the periodical declarations of intemperate zealots, and that having hitherto lived free from its influence and obligations, they know not what spirit they are of, and mistake the spirit of Protestantism, which they adopt in practice, for that of Catholicism, which they embrace in theory. It is not for the welfare of these kingdoms that this anomaly should be put an end to; and if we cannot persuade our Roman Catholic brethren to become consistent by conforming their principles to their practice, we trust they never may be compelled to assimilate their practice to their principles. We are well content to see the Roman Catholic laity an imperfectly drilled militia, and are no wise reconciled to the title of Archbishop of WESTMINSTER, because it is conferred in order to introduce, under the name of canon law, those articles of war which would change them into a regular army.

---

PERSECUTING OATH OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND ARCHBISHOPS.

DR. J. CUMMING VS. CARDINAL WISEMAN.

*To the Editor of the London Times.*

SIR,—At a lecture at the Hanover rooms on the 7th instant, relating the oath taken by Romish Archbishops on their receiving the Archiepiscopal *pallium*, I remarked:—

‘First of all, let me presume that when the Cardinal was made Archbishop he received the *pallium*, before receiving which he repeated a solemn oath which will be found in the *Pontificale Romanum*. I have the book, and have carefully examined all he must say; in the edition of Clement VIII., Antwerp edition, 1627; one clause of the oath is as follows:—Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et rebelles, Domino Nostro, vel Successoribus prædictis, pro posse persequor et impugnabo. That is, he solemnly swore on his most solemn oath (I wish thus to prepare you for his

reception:)—‘All heretics (that is, Protestants) Schismatics (that is, members of the Greek Church that separated, as they say, from Rome,) and rebels against our Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will persecute and attack to the utmost of my power; the correct translation, I believe, of *pro posse*.’

On entering the rooms on Wednesday last to give my second lecture, I received a letter from the Cardinal’s secretary, enclosing the following communication from Cardinal Wiseman:—

St. Georges, Southwark, Nov. 19.

SIR,—Dr. Cumming gives an extract from the oath taken by bishops and archbishops, copied from the Pontifical, printed at Antwerp, 1627, and states,—I presume that Cardinal Wiseman, on receiving the *pallium*, took that oath. To prevent further misunderstanding, I have the Cardinal’s permission to state to you that by a rescript of Pope Pius VII., dated April 12, 1818, the clause quoted by the Dr. and so subject to misunderstanding, is omitted by all bishops and archbishops who are subject to the British Crown.

The authorized copy now lying before me, used by our bishops, is headed,—

“Forma Juramenti.”

“Pro Episcopis et Vicariis Apostolicis Episcopali dignitate præditi qui in locis, Magnæ Britanniae subjectis versantur, prescripta a SS. Pio. VII. die 12 Aprilis, 1818. In the copy of the Pontifical kept at the Episcopal residence in Golden Square, the copy *perhaps* generally used in the consecration of bishops in England, the sentence is cancelled. Dr. Cumming is at liberty to inspect this, if he will arrange with me for that purpose.”

My allegation was, that every bishop, on receiving the *pallium*, without which he cannot assume the title of Archbishop, nor consecrate other bishops—which *pallium* Dr. Wiseman states he received after being appointed Archbishop of Westminster—is required in the *Pontificale Romanum* to swear, among other things, ‘I will persecute and attack heretics, schismatics and rebels to the Pope.’

Dr. Wiseman sent this message by his secretary just before I began my lecture, as I have already said, informing me that the said persecuting clause is omitted in the oath taken by all bishops and archbishops subject to the British Crown!

I accepted the invitation, and this day, in company with Sir J. Heron Maxwell and Admiral Vernon Harcourt, I inspected the Cardinal's *Pontifical*, submitted to me at the episcopal residence, Golden Square. In the *Pontifical* thus laid before me I found in the bishop's oath the very words I quoted, and in bold type, but with a line of black ink drawn over the passage, with a pen apparently very recently used, leaving the words disclaimed by the Cardinal sufficiently legible, but without any initials or other verification of any sort. On the fly leaf at the beginning of the book I found the same oath in MS., without the persecuting clause, and without initials, or other verification, and apparently very recently written. But the startling fact remains. On referring to the oath required to be taken by an archbishop—(Dr. Wiseman having recently been made one,)—On receiving the *pallium*, as given at page 88, (Paris edition, 1664) of the *Pontifical* thus submitted to me by order of the Cardinal, I found the persecuting clause—'Hæreticos, schismaticos et rebelles, Domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequor et impugnabo,' printed in bold type, without any alteration, correction, or emendation whatsoever, constituting, in the Archbishop of Westminster's own *Pontifical*, part and parcel of the oath which every archbishop, on receiving the *pallium*, as I have already stated, must take.

The discovery needs no comment beyond my expression of surprise that the Cardinal should have had the temerity to invite me to inspect his *Pontificale Romanum*.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN CUMMING.

Nov. 25.

*Remarks.* The foregoing incident is important in several respects.

1. According to the Cardinal's own admission the infal-

lible church, in her proud boast of unity and uniformity, does establish and enforce laws in one part of her dominion which she dispenses with in other parts. 2. It is an admission that in all other countries except Great Britain the offensive clause is still in force, and every bishop and archbishop except those subject to the British Crown, is sworn to "*persecute and attack all heretics, schismatics, and rebels against the Pope.*" So Americans may understand that every Catholic Bishop in these United States is bound by that solemn oath.

3. It shows the unscrupulousness of the archbishop's conscience, when the honour and interest of the church were in peril. What reliance can be placed on the word of a man who would descend to such a deed?

---

THE QUEEN, LORD JOHN RUSSELL, FIRST LORD OF THE  
TREASURY, OR PREMIER OF ENGLAND, &c.

The appearance of the Pope's bull, constituting the Romish Hierarchy of England, at once gave alarm to the government. The Queen is said to have been greatly excited, and to have given utterance to language like the following. "This is too bad; I am Queen of England, and I will not submit to it." Lord John Russell immediately issued a letter, declaring the action of the Pope to be an intrenchment on the prerogatives of the Crown, and to be *insolent and insidious*. The Bishops of the English Church, the clergy, and the laity of all denominations, throughout England, have sent addresses to the Queen, reiterating the same sentiments. Even members of the bar in large numbers, say nearly a hundred, send their manifesto to her Majesty, declaring that a "foreign potentate has interfered with her Majesty's undoubted prerogative, and has assumed the right of nominating Bishops and Archbishops in these realms, and of conferring on them territorial rank and jurisdiction."

Some of the nobility, Lord Beaumont in particular, a member of the Roman Catholic Church, has expressed himself in similar terms, and denounced the entire proceedings of the Pope.



Nor are the vulgar rabble indifferent to passing events. The vilest passions of the human heart have been stirred up, and vented themselves in a manner disgraceful to any civilized country. The transactions at Exeter, on the anniversary of the gunpowder plot, will constitute a dark page in the history of Old England. The burning in effigy of the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman, &c., should never have been tolerated by any government professing to be Christian. The only effect it can have will be to alienate the feelings of those insulted, excite a spirit of revenge, and create a sympathy for the persecuted where it would not otherwise exist. It will, in short, further the cause it was designed to retard.

#### CARDINAL WISEMAN'S REPLY.

Cardinal Wiseman has, in an appeal to the people of England, replied to the letter of Lord John Russell and the other assaults made on him and the Pope. It is calm and dignified; it enters elaborately into the merits of the question, and argues it from facts and documents, which, it must be confessed, has not in general been done by his opponents. Among the many scores of public addresses and letters published in the English papers, we find but few which present any thing more than declamatory appeals to popular prejudice, and denunciation without argument, against the illegality and unconstitutionality of the acts of the papacy.

The Archbishop thus remarks upon Lord John Russell's declaration, that the manner of establishing the Hierarchy had been "*insolent and insidious*:"

"The words in this title are extracted from the too memorable letter of the First Lord of the Treasury. I am willing to consider that production as a private act, and not as any manifesto of the intention of her Majesty's Government. Unfortunately, it is difficult to abstract one's mind from the high and responsible situation of the writer, or consider him as unpledged by any thing that he puts forth. There are parts of the letter on which I would here refrain from commenting, because they might

lead me aside, in sorrow, if not in anger, from the drier path of my present duty. I will leave it to others, therefore, to dwell upon many portions of that letter, upon the closing paragraph in particular, which pronounces a sentence as awfully unjust as it was uncalled for, on the religion of many millions of her Majesty's subjects, nearly all Ireland, and some of our most flourishing colonies. The charge uttered in the ear of that island, in which all guarantees for genuine and pure Catholic education will, of necessity, be considered in future, as guarantees for "confining the intellect and enslaving the soul," all securities for the Catholic religion as "security for the mummeries of superstition," in the mind of their giver—guarantees and securities which can hardly be believed to be heartily offered—the charge thus made, in a voice that has been applauded by the Protestantism of England, produces in the Catholic heart a feeling too sickly and too deadening for indignation; a dismal despair at finding that, where we have honoured, and supported and followed for years, we may be spurned and cast off the first moment that popularity demands us as its price, or bigotry as its victim.

But to proceed—so little was I, on my part, aware that such feelings as that letter disclosed existed in the head of our Government on the subject of the Hierarchy; that, having occasion to write to his Lordship on some business, I took the liberty of continuing my letter as follows:—

"Vienna, Nov. 3, 1850.

"My Lord—I cannot but most deeply regret the erroneous, and even distorted view which the English papers have presented, of what the Holy See has done in regard to the spiritual government of the Catholics of England. But I take the liberty of stating that the measure now promulgated was not only prepared, but printed three years ago, and a copy of it was shown to Lord Minto by the Pope, on occasion of an audience given to his Lordship by his Holiness. I have no right to intrude upon your Lordship further in this matter, beyond offering to give any explanation which your Lordship may desire, in full

confidence that it may be in my power to remove, particularly the offensive interpretation put upon the late act of the Holy See, that it was suggested by political views, or by any hostile feelings. And, with regard to myself, I beg to add, that I am invested with a purely Ecclesiastical dignity—that my duties will be, what they have ever been, to promote the morality of those committed to my charge, especially the masses of our poor, and keep up those feelings of good will and friendly intercommunion between Catholics and their fellow-countrymen, which I flatter myself I have been the means of somewhat improving. I am confident that time will soon show, what a temporary excitement may conceal, that social and public advantages must result from taking the Catholics of England out of that irregular and necessarily temporary state of government in which they have been placed, and extending to them that ordinary and more definite form which is normal to their Church, and which has already been so beneficially bestowed upon almost every colony of the British Empire. I beg to apologize for intruding at such length on your lordship's attention; but I have been encouraged to do so by the uniform kindness and courtesy which I have always met with from every member of her Majesty's Government with whom I have had occasion to treat, and from your Lordship in particular, and by a sincere desire that such friendly communication should not be interrupted.

I have the honor to be, my Lord, your Lordship's obedient servant, (Signed) "N. CARD. WISEMAN.

"The Right Hon. the Lord John Russell,  
First Lord of the Treasury,  
&c., &c., &c.,"

I give this letter because it will show that there was nothing in my mind to prepare me for that warm expression of feeling that was manifested in the Premier's letter; which, though it appeared a day or two before mine, I must consider as my only reply; and I do not think that the tone of my letter will be found to indicate the existence of any insolent or insidious design.

It is my duty, therefore, now to show, calmly and dispassionately, and apart from any party feelings, the reasons which led me and others to believe that no reasonable objection could exist to our obtaining the organization of our Hierarchy in England.

1. It was notorious not only that in Ireland the Catholic Hierarchy had been recognised, and even royally honoured, but that the same form of Ecclesiastical government had been gradually extended to the greater part of our colonies. Australia was the first which obtained this advantage by the erection of the Archiepiscopal See of Sidney, with the Suffragans at Maitland, Hobart-town, Adelaide, Perth, Melbourne, and Port Victoria. This was done openly, was known publicly, and no remonstrance was ever made. Those Prelates in every document take their titles, and they are acknowledged and salaried as Archbishops and Bishops respectively, and this not by one, but by successive governments.

Our North American possessions next received the same boon. Kingston, Toronto, Bytown, Halifax have been erected into dioceses by the Holy See. Those titles are acknowledged by the local governments. In an Act "Enacted by the Queen's excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Canada" (12th Vic., c. 136,) the Right Rev. J. E. Guignes is called "Roman Catholic Bishop of Bytown," and is incorporated by the title of "the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Bytown."

In an Act passed March 21, 1849, (12th Vic., c. 31,) the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh is styled "Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Halifax, Nova Scotia;" and through the Act he is called the Roman Catholic Bishop of the said Diocese.

Lately, again, after mature consideration, the Holy See has formed a new Ecclesiastical province in the West Indies, by which several Vicars-Apostolic have been appointed Bishops in ordinary.

But there has been a more remarkable instance of the exercise of the Papal supremacy in the erection of



Bishoprics nearer home.—Galway was not an Episcopal See till a few years ago. It was governed by a Warden elected periodically by what are called the Tribes of Galway—that is, by families bearing certain names, every member of whom had a vote. Serious inconveniences resulted from this anomalous state of things, and hence it was put an end to by the Holy See, which changed the wardenship into a Bishopric, and appointed the Right Rev. Dr. Browne, since translated to Elphin, first Bishop of that diocese. Bishop Browne was consecrated Oct. 23, 1831. No remonstrance was made, no outcry raised at this exercise of Papal power.

But to return to our colonies. It had come to pass, that, with the exception of India, hardly a Vicar-Apostolic was left in our foreign possessions. Far am I from blaming the sound policy of successive administrations, which had seen the practical inconveniences of a half toleration, and semi-recognition, where friendly official intercourse and co-operation was necessary. But I may ask, is it any thing unreasonable, extravagant, still more, “insolent and insidious,” in the Catholics of England, to have sought and obtained what insignificant dependencies had received? Many of the Bishops of the new dioceses had scarcely a dozen Priests, and but scattered flocks, generally poor emigrants. And could it be supposed, that they intended to remain for ever in a temporary or professional state, when they possessed not only stately churches, eight or ten great and generally beautiful colleges, and many extensive charitable institutions, but nearly six hundred public churches or chapels, and eight hundred Clergy; and when they reckoned in their body some of the most distinguished men of the country? But, moreover, the increase of Bishops, from four to eight, was already found to be insufficient, and it was become expedient to increase it to twelve or thirteen. Now, an episcopate of thirteen Vicars-Apostolic, without, of course, a Metropolitan, would have been an anomaly, an irregularity, without parallel in the Church. Was it, then, something so unnatural and monstrous in us to call for what our colonies had received? or had we any reason to anticipate that the act would have

been characterized in the terms which I do not love to repeat?

2. But, further, considering the manner in which acts of the Royal supremacy had been exercised abroad, and taking it for granted that it could not be greater when exercised in foreign Catholic countries than the Pope's in our regard, we could not suppose that his appointment of Catholic Bishops in ordinary in England would have been considered as more "inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy," than the exercise was considered "inconsistent with the Pope's supremacy" acknowledged in those countries. I will refer my readers to Mr. Bowyer's pamphlet, published by Ridgeway, for details of what I will briefly state.

In 1842 her Majesty was advised to erect, and did erect (5 Vic., c. 6,) a Bishopric of Jerusalem, assigning to it a diocese in which the three great Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, were merged into one See, having Episcopal jurisdiction over Syria, Chaldea, Egypt and Abyssinia, subject to further limitations or alterations at the Royal will. No one supposes, that, for instance, the consent of the King of Abyssinia, in which there is not a single Protestant congregation, was asked. Mr. Bowyer also shows that Bishop Alexander was not sent merely to British subjects, but to others owing no allegiance to the Crown of England. Suppose his Majesty of Abyssinia, or the Emir Beshir, had pronounced this to be an intrusion "inconsistent with the spiritual independence of the nation," how much would this country have cared?

Under the same statute a Bishop of Gibraltar was named. His See was in a British territory, but its jurisdiction extended over Malta, where there was a Roman Catholic Archbishop, formally recognised by the British Government as the Bishop of Malta—and over Italy.

Under this commission Dr. Tomlinson officiated in Rome, and, I understand, had borne before him a cross, the emblem of Archiepiscopal jurisdiction, as if to ignore in his very diocese the acknowledged "Bishop of Rome." He confirmed and preached there, without leave of the

lawful Bishop ; and yet the newspapers took no notice of it, and the pulpits did not denounce him. But, in fact, the statute under which these things were done is so comprehensive that it empowers the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consecrate not only British subjects, but subjects and citizens of any foreign State, to be Bishops in any foreign country. No consent of the respective Governments is required ; and they are sent not only to British subjects, but to "such other Protestant congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his or their authority."

If, therefore, the Royal supremacy of the English Crown could thus lawfully exercise itself where it never has before exercised authority, and where it is not recognised, as in a Catholic country—if the Queen, as head of the English Church, can send bishops into Abyssinia and Italy, surely Catholics had good right to suppose that, with the full toleration granted them, and the permitted exercise of Papal supremacy in their behalf, no less would be permitted to them, without censure or rebuke.

3. But not only had Catholics every ground to feel justified by what had been elsewhere done before, doing the same then as themselves seemed expedient, without their act, any more than preceding ones, being characterized, as we have seen, but positive declarations and public assurances led them to the same conclusion.

In 1841 or 1842, when, for the first time, the Holy See thought of erecting a Hierarchy in North America, I was commissioned to sound the feelings of Government on the subject. I came up to London for the purpose, and saw the Under Secretary for the Colonies, of which Lord Stanley was then Secretary. I shall not easily forget the urbanity of my reception, nor the interesting conversation that took place, in which much was spoken to me which has since come literally true. But on the subject of my mission, the answer given was something to this effect :—

"What does it matter to us what you call yourselves, whether Vicars-Apostolic or Bishops, or Muftis, or Imauns, so that you do not ask us to do any thing for you?

We have no right to prevent you taking any title among yourselves." This, however, the distinguished gentleman alluded to, observed was his private opinion, and he desired me to call in a few days after. I did so, and he assured me that, having laid the matter before the head of the department, the answer was the same as he had before given me. I wrote it to Rome, and it served no doubt as the basis of the nomination of bishops in ordinary in North America. I have no doubt the documents referring to this transaction will be found in the Colonial Office. In the debate on the Catholic Relief Bill, July 9, 1845, Lord John Russell, then in opposition, spoke to the following effect:—"He, for one, was prepared to go into committee on those clauses of the Act of 1829. He did not say that he was at once prepared to repeal all those clauses, but he was willing to go into committee to deliberate on this subject. He believed that he might repeal those disallowing clauses which prevented a Roman Catholic Bishop assuming a title held by a Bishop of the Established Church. He could not conceive any good ground for the continuance of this restriction." It must be observed that there is nothing in the context which limits these sensible and liberal words to Ireland. They apply to the repeal of the whole clause, which, as we have seen, extends equally to both countries.

What his Lordship had said in 1845, he deliberately, and even more strongly, confirmed the following year. In the debate on the first reading of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, February 5, 1846, he referred to his speech, just quoted, of the preceding session, in the following terms:—

"Allusion having been made to him (by Sir Robert Inglis,) he wished to say a few words as to his former declaration, 'that he was not ready at once to repeal these laws without consideration.' Last session he had voted for the committee, but had reserved to himself the right of weighing the details. It appeared to him that there was one part of the question that had not been sufficiently attended to; the measure of Government, as far as it was stated last year, did not effect that relief to the Roman



Catholics from a law by which they were punished, both for assuming Episcopal titles in Ireland, and for belonging to certain Religious Orders. That part of the subject required interference by the Legislature. As to preventing persons assuming particular titles, nothing could be more absurd and puerile than to keep up such a distinction. He had also the strongest objection to the law which made Jesuits in certain cases subject to transportation; the enactment was as intolerant as it was inefficacious, and it was necessary that the law should be put on an intelligible and rational footing."

It would appear, therefore, that whatever hesitation Lord John Russell had about repealing other clauses in the Emancipation Act, his mind was made up about the restriction of Catholics assuming the very titles of Sees held by Anglican Bishops. Had he obtained his wishes in 1846, the law would have permitted us to call ourselves Bishops of London or Chester, and Archbishop of Canterbury. I quote these passages, not for the purpose of charging Lord John Russell with inconsistency, but merely to justify ourselves, and show how little reason we could have had for believing that our acting strictly within the law respecting Episcopal titles, would have been described as it has. For if it was puerile in 1846 to continue to prevent Catholics even taking the prohibited titles, and no good reason existed for the continuance of even that restriction, is it manly in 1850 to denounce as "insolent and insidious" the assumption of titles different from those accorded to us by the authority which Lord John acknowledges can alone bestow Episcopacy upon us?

I have already alluded to Lord Minto's being shown the Brief for the Hierarchy, printed about two years ago. The circumstance may have escaped his memory, or he may not at the time have attended to it, having more important matters in his mind. But as to the fact that his attention was called to it, and he made no reply, I can have no doubt.

I trust, therefore, that I have said enough to prove that Catholics have not acted in any unbecoming manner in claiming for themselves the same right of possessing a

Hierarchy as had been allowed to the colonies, and clearly acknowledged as no less applicable to them. One more topic remains.

VI.—THE TITLE OF WESTMINSTER.

The selection of this title for the Metropolitan See of the new Hierarchy has, I understand, given great offence. I am sorry for it. It was little less than necessity which led to its adoption. I must observe, that, according to the discipline of the Catholic Church, a Bishop's title must be from a town or city. Originally, almost every village or small town had its bishop, as appears from the history of the Anglican Church. But to a town or a city Bishopric, as may be, a "territorial" title is never given. Thus, in Van Dieman's Land, while the Anglican Bishop takes his title of Tasmania from the territory, the Catholic derives his of Hobart Town from the town. In re-establishing a Catholic Hierarchy in England, it was natural and decorous that its metropolitan should have his See at the capital. This has been the rule at all times; though these capitals may decay into provincial towns without losing their privilege. The very term Metropolitan signifies the bishop of the metropolis. This being the principal or basis of every Hierarchy, how was it to be acted on here? London was a title inhibited by law, Southwark was to form a separate See. To have taken the title of a subordinate portion of what forms the great conglomerate of London, as Finsbury or Islington, would have been to cast ridicule, and open the door for jeers upon the new Episcopate. Besides, none of these are towns or cities. Westminster naturally suggested itself, as a city unoccupied by an Anglican See, and giving an honourable and well-known metropolitan title. It was consequently selected, and I can sincerely say, that I had no part whatever in the selection. But I rejoice that it was chosen, not because it was the seat of the Courts of Law, or of Parliament, or for any such purpose, but because it brings the real point more clearly and strikingly before our opponents; "Have we in any thing acted contrary to law? And, if not, why are we to be blamed?"

But I am glad also for another reason. The Chapter of Westminster has been the first to protest against the new Archiepiscopal title, as though some practical attempt at jurisdiction within the Abbey was intended. Then let me give them assurance on that point, and let us come to a fair division and a good understanding.

The diocese, indeed, of Westminster embraces a large district, but Westminster proper consists of two very different parts. One comprises the stately abbey, with its adjacent palaces and its royal parks. To this portion the duties and occupation of the Dean and Chapter are mainly confined; and they shall range there undisturbed. To the venerable old church I may repair, as I have been wont to do. But perhaps the Dean and Chapter are not aware that were I disposed to claim more than the right to tread the Catholic pavement of that noble building, and breathe its air of ancient consecration, another might step in with a prior claim. For successive generations there has existed ever, in the Benedictine order, an Abbot of Westminster, the representative, in religious dignity, of those who erected, and beautified, and governed that church and cloister. Have they heard of any claim or protest on his part touching their temporalities? Then let them fear no greater aggression now. Like him, I may visit, as I have said, the old Abbey, and say my prayer by the shrine of good St. Edward, and meditate on the olden times, when the church filled without a coronation, and multitudes hourly worshipped without a service.

We quote this extract to give the reader, 1st, an idea of the character of the appeal, and 2d, to exhibit in some degree the power of the church of Rome in the British dominions. It will appear, from this document, that in *all* the colonies of Great Britain Rome has established her Hierarchy; that in some of them popery is not only tolerated but supported from the Treasury of the State at least in part;—it will also be seen that in England, where they had, in 1814, 44 chapels of an obscure character, that now they possess stately churches, eight or ten colleges, many extensive charitable institutions, 600 public churches, 800 clergy, and number some of the most dis-

tinguished men of the country ; with twelve bishops, and a Cardinal Archbishop.

The position of Lord John Russell is certainly not an enviable one, after his speeches in Parliament in favour of the abolition of Catholic disabilities, and particularly that part which prohibited persons from assuming particular titles, of which he says, nothing could be more "absurd and puerile."

---

LOYAL ADDRESS OF THE CATHOLICS OF ENGLAND TO THE QUEEN.

In the midst of the great movement, Dr. Wiseman has drafted an address to the Queen, expressive of their loyalty. It is ably drawn up, and cannot fail to contribute much toward a reaction in the public mind in favour of the Romish party. The signatures to this address will develop another important fact, and that is, the strength of the Catholics.

The following, from the London Tablet, will give an idea of this fact.

"The Cardinal's appeal to the good sense of the English people, and the pamphlet of Mr. G. Bowyer, D. C. L. and Q. C., on the Hierarchy, seems together to exhaust the whole question. Mr. Bowyer has given to his legal friends an exceedingly difficult "nut to crack." There has also been circulated, in the shape of posters and handbills, an appeal to the magnanimity of the English people in the present crisis, in which they are told that we believe in the Queen's supremacy over our consciences just as little as the immense majority of the English nation. However, perhaps, the tone of the noble address of the Catholics of Birmingham to their fellow townsmen surpasses this; it takes its stand on the ground of our numbers and our rights. It is a noble document."

The London correspondent of the *Tablet* remarks upon the above as follows:—

"The Cardinal has forwarded to all the clergy of his diocese an address expressive of loyalty to the Queen, which has already appeared in the papers, and which he ordered not merely to lie at the church doors for signa-



tures, but to be intrusted to persons to carry round to the homes of all the Catholics of the parish. If this order is decently carried out, a very imposing number of names will be subscribed to the address. It has shown a much larger amount of Catholic population in some places than we could have had any reason to expect. For instance, in Clapham, where, three years ago, the utmost exertion could barely discover forty Catholics, it was ascertained that nearly seven hundred different persons attended the various services last Sunday. Such was the number of names then subscribed. Of course, in large parishes like St. George's, where the estimated number of Catholics is 25,000, it can scarcely be hoped that so large a proportion of signatures can be obtained. \* \* \* \*

From all these exhibitions of the position of the contending parties, and the general tone of the press, we cannot but regard the movement on the whole as one of the most important in favour of the Romanists, which has ever transpired since the Reformation. The action of the Protestants is so violent, and, if I may so say, reckless, that it is impossible for the excitement to be kept up for any length of time: and when once reaction begins it will be equally extreme in the other direction. It is a law of nature, that reaction must correspond to the action. England has no law which can interfere with the Papal movement; and even had she, it would but be the signal for a war of extermination between the two parties for her to attempt its execution. There is no alternative but to submit to the movement, and let the affair for the present take its course: that course will be the rapid progress of the growing power of the church of Rome in England, until the *one-third* of the subjects of Queen Victoria, which they now claim as subjects of the Pope, shall become a majority, and, by legal enactments, or, which is more probable, by brute force, they will do with England as they now propose to do with Prussia. But her fate is sealed, and she is doomed to fall beneath the power of the papacy. We subjoin for consideration the following item.

THE ROMISH CHURCH.—We speak from a knowledge of the facts of the case, when we say, that circumstances

will transpire in the course of 10 or 12 days, perhaps sooner, which will startle the religious world. Something resembling a regularly organized conspiracy will be proved to have been entered into by a number of influential Tractarian clergymen, with the heads of the Romish Church in this country, with the view of destroying the Anglican establishment. We believe that documentary evidence of the fact will be forthcoming before a fortnight has elapsed. We do not think it would be judicious to say more on the subject at present.—*London Morning Advertiser*.

---

### PROTESTANT PRUSSIA.

Prussia is the only continental European government of any considerable strength, which is Protestant, or opposes any great barrier to the complete triumph of Romanism. It would be an easy matter to dispose of the German States, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, &c., were Prussia once under the Papal sway. It is not, therefore, a matter of wonder that a deep anxiety should be felt on the part of the Catholic world for the overthrow of the present Prussian dynasty, and thus end the reign of Protestantism in that country. A few extracts from the *London Catholic Standard*, will show the Catholic views and feelings on the subject of present movement. They remark, "We say again and again, that Europe is at *the commencement of a NEW AND FEARFUL CRISIS OF HER EXISTENCE*. It is certainly possible, by a few human expedients, to stay off the evil for a time; but it cannot be stayed off long. But why consider it an evil? Europe is diseased, and she must pay the penalty. She has been called upon to repent in sackcloth for her crimes, and she has disregarded the voice that called her.

Austria and France have indeed exhibited symptoms of contrition—have aided the Holy Father of Christendom with their treasure and their blood.

Prussia, though immensely strong in an army of 200,000 men, will not be able to stand against the united will of Austria and France; much less against the colossus of

the North. But let Austria and France hold together as brothers, and as the two great limbs of the Catholic centre, and we have no fear for the result.

But *will* Prussia hang out the black flag of Anarchy and death when the indignant hosts of Europe surround her? There can be no doubt but she will do so, if driven to extremity. \* \* She is, indeed, without political faith, as she has ever been without a religious one. Of what use then, we may ask, is her existence to Europe? Selfish, unprincipled, and base, truckling at one time to the Despot, at another to the Anarchist, *may she perish, fearfully perish*; and if France and Austria can divide her provinces, so far from it being a day of mourning with us, we will sing a *Te Deum* over so Catholic an event."

Again, he says, "Meanwhile, while Catholics, true and false, are allowed a short time to set their house in order, to prepare for a great and fearful contest between the powers of light and darkness, which will in the end spread itself to this country, and while we have each one a brief time allotted to decide beforehand whether we will grasp the jewel of our faith, firmly and unflinchingly amidst persecution, or lose it finally and for ever, the armies of Europe are marching in battle array.

Speaking of the mustering hosts, the Standard says:

"In what will all this end? We shall have much to enlighten us on this subject before long. Meanwhile all Europe needs our prayers, for on the fate of Europe depends the fate of the world, and on the fate of the world the ultimate triumph of Catholicism.

From the foregoing extracts it is manifest that the Catholics regard the impending war as a religious war, which is to result in the universal triumph of Catholicism. Will it be replied, that they presume too much on the intervention of France on the part of popery? that France can never consent to the destruction of Prussia and the overthrow of German democracy, without striking a death blow to their own Republican government? What greater sacrifice of principle, we ask, would be required to do this than to crush the Roman Republic? But Catholicism is triumphant in France. Let the reader ponder the following

statement of the strength of the papacy in that country, with its growing influence.

SECRET CATHOLIC SOCIETIES IN FRANCE.

A correspondent of the *New York Commercial* says the most powerful political society now in existence in France is the Catholic one of St. Vincent de Paul. Its branches are to be found in every ward in Paris, and in every city, commune and village in France. Organized with the usual ability of the Catholic priesthood, it avails itself with adroitness and skill of the best means of extending its influence.

The correspondent has these comments:—Some time since I pointed out the immense concession made to the Roman hierarchy in the law of public instruction; and afterward, the attempt of that party to overthrow the normal schools, and so cut off at the fountain head the supply of professors for the colleges of the university.

The attempt failed in the National Assembly, but, as the party never gives up an enterprise once commenced, it has been renewed in the Supreme Council of Public Instruction, and apparently with success, for the Archbishop of Tours, the Bishop of Orleans, the Bishop of Langres, and M. COUSIN have been appointed a committee to reform the normal school. They will reform it with a vengeance.

Meanwhile, the priesthood is marching in silence to the occupation of the schools and colleges. Every week the newspapers contain accounts of some institution passing into their hands. The communal colleges are easily secured by the Jesuits. These gentlemen go to the Communal Council, and hold some such language as this: "Gentlemen, your college costs you annually ten thousand francs more than its receipts. We will take it for nothing, and give your sons just as good an education as they receive at present; or we will consent to pay you a small amount for the privilege." This is a tempting offer for a commune already burdened with taxes. It is accepted. The Jesuits take possession. They have no wives and children to support; their clothing is simple, and made by one of their own order. The cook and porter are also



Jesuits; all the professors live in common. What wonder is it that the college yields handsome revenue? Little by little the course of studies is changed. Church traditions, the Hebrew and other dead languages are substituted for the sciences and practical knowledge. Valuable years which should be passed in invigorating the intellect and developing the moral character, are lost in poring over legends or listening to the trumped up evidence of impostures. The approach of Catholicism is insidious but sure and deadly. A nation infected with it either rejects it by a violent effort, and adopts Protestantism, like England, skepticism, like France, or else dies gradually of moral atrophy, like Spain. But it never loosens its hold, except when torn away by force, and even then returns quietly to the attack. It is now making active use of its alliance with the French reaction, and pitching its tents in France as if it were to stay there for ever. The protestants are harassed every where already, and if the Catholics continue for a few years their present rate of progress, France will be brought back to the terrible intolerance of the period between 1815 and 1830. On one thing the opposition is resolved when its turn of power shall come—that is, to lose no time in breaking down the political organization of the Catholic hierarchy, and to sever their connexion with the state, leaving the field open to Protestantism.”

A similar society has been organized in Austria, under the name of *Young Catholics*, whose object is to demand and obtain the execution of the concessions the government has made to the Catholic Church.

---

## PAPAL PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

The appointment of Bishop Hughes to the Archbishopric of New York, together with his famous lecture on the decline of protestantism, has constituted a new era in the Catholic controversy in the United States. Since the days of Dr. Brownlee's agitation of the subject, there has been an appalling apathy in the protestant world on the

subject of papal progress in the United States. The recent onset of Archbishop Hughes has produced an effort in the protestant church to reply to his assault and repel his charges. The address of Dr. Berg was the first of a series of onsets against the Archbishop's assumptions of the decline of the one, and advance of the other.

The eloquence of Dr. Berg's address needs no commendation from us; with his arguments on several points at issue between catholics and protestants, we have no complaint to make; we believe his position to be invulnerable so far as fact and argument go. There is one point, however, in which the public have a deep interest; it is the great point at issue, whether it is true or not, that popery is increasing and protestantism declining, which we are constrained to regard as not satisfactorily met.

The assertion that "protestantism is as strong in Europe in the aggregate to-day, as it was fifty years after the reformation," is more easily made than demonstrated. Then, the corruptions of Rome were glaring, and an indignant world spurned the system of abomination from them;—now, all the tendencies of Europe are towards popery. In every country it has gained vast resources, and has stealthily entrenched itself, until, in proud defiance, it now dares to proclaim its triumphs in the face of the world. Italy is a seeming exception:—I say *seeming*, for it is not so in reality. During the Italian revolution, the people never rejected the supremacy of the pope in spirituals: all they required, or do require to this day, is the secularization of the government of the state. They even went so far as to say, "Secularize the government, and we are willing you should even strengthen the ecclesiastical power of the pope." But that there is a spirit of determined hostility to the papal temporalities, is freely conceded.

"The voice of that indignant nation, (England,) shouting in tones of mighty remonstrance against the stealthy and arrogant advances of the papacy, waking an echo in protestant America," only proves what the Rev. orator was endeavouring to disprove,—the progress of popery to be onward, until it has become alarming. The gigantic, but vain throes of Britain to deliver herself of the mighty load

which threatens her ruin, only proves the truth of the archbishop's assertion. Could she release herself from the grasp of the giant, there would be hope; but she cannot.

#### POPERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

But what are the condition and prospects of popery in the United States? The answer must be, if a true response is given, that its relative increase, when compared with protestantism, is almost beyond estimation. Take, as an example, New England, the land of the puritan pilgrims.

In Nov. 1825, the late Bishop Fenwick was appointed to the bishopric of Boston, and his diocess embraced all New England. He had under him in all that field, two churches and two priests. There is at the present time two diocesses, if not more, in the same territory; and scarce a village of importance, where there is not a catholic church thronged with worshippers; besides all their seminaries and other institutions. The Boston Pilot now estimates *one third* of the entire population of Boston to be Roman Catholics. Nor will this estimate be considered too high by those who are acquainted with the facts.

It is not wise for us to blind ourselves to the real state of things. We may be considered an alarmist, but whatever may be the estimate in which we are held, we are bound to sound the trumpet when we behold danger. It has always been a thankless work to proclaim danger, nor do we expect it will be less so now than in former days. But we will speak freely: we are compelled by the force of evidence, to believe the triumph of Romanism in this country to be an event not many years before us, in the ordinary course of events. The sweeping tide of emigration, by which hundreds of thousands of catholics are yearly landed on our shores, is enough of itself to convince the most skeptical. But in addition to this, neither arts, pains, labour, nor expense are spared, to secure an influence over the rising generation. The splendour of their churches, the blandishments of their literary institutions, the wily influences of the priests, Jesuits, sisters of charity, &c., are all brought to bear on the object with powerful effect.

The ballot-box, even, is converted into an instrument of proselytism. Nor is it any thing unnatural, that any body of men should use their political power to promote their

interests. We do not speak of it by way of complaint; but as an existing fact, at which protestants should look and take into the account, in making up their estimate of catholic influence and progress. There is with them a surprising interest felt in reference to the privileges of the ballot box. We subjoin an item illustrative of this point.

“SALEM, MASS.—Our people in Salem seem to be alive to the importance of becoming citizens of this free and enlightened confederacy. Several meetings have already been held, and an association formed for the purpose of mutually assisting each other in this important movement.

“A more recent letter from Mr. O'Donnell informs us that a Naturalization Society has been formed; each member is to pay 12½ cents monthly. This money is to be reserved to pay for the final papers of the members, pay poll tax, and aid those who are not able to pay for being naturalized. Thirty-five have already declared their intentions.”

We have remarked on the subject of emigration; we revert to it again for the purpose of introducing an extract from an Irish paper, presenting a new phase of the great work. It is headed

### “MONSTER EMIGRATION.

We have to notice emigration in a “monster” form—the emigration of no fewer than twelve hundred of our neighbours of both sexes and all ages—not leaving the land of their birth and the early home of their cherished affections to be scattered over the earth's surface distant and separate, but animated with the one spirit, bound, in general, in early ties of relationship and intimate friendships, depart together to settle down together in the same union and friendship in the far distant, but healthy and fertile plains of the Arkansas territory, all inhabitants of the diocese of Ferns in the counties of Wexford and Wicklow. The guide and guardian of this colony is the Rev. Thos. Hore, up to the present time the pious and beloved parish priest of Annacurra and Kilaveny, partly in the counties of Wexford and Wicklow, and about 900 of the emigrants are his



old parishioners; the remainder, persons of character and some worldly substance, recommended to him by the local clergy, or personally known by himself. This most respectable, and respect-commanding body, are not, like too many of their countrymen, flying houseless and evicted, and sent on the world by the hand of the exterminator, but volunteers who, with prudent foresight, calculating on the future by what they know of the past, have determined on the steps they are taking, and any little that remained of what they had honestly and honourably acquired by the sweat of their brows, they are determined to convert to the solace of their old days and the comforts of their families in a land where no landlords shall question their lease or raise their rents. The Rev. Mr. Hore is a native of the barony of Forth in this county. He went every where to make the best and surest arrangements for their conveyance across the Atlantic, and in a few days this volunteer exile body will sail from Liverpool to New Orleans *en route* to their final settlement on the banks of the Arkansas.—*Wexford Guardian*.

However great the influx and relative increase of the catholic population in the eastern states, it is notorious that the tide of emigration is westward: the great valley of the Mississippi is the point of attraction and concentration; the location which, above all others, promises to be the seat of empire in this great country. There is no instrumentality in existence to prevent the success of their plan of operation.

We come now to consider the great question; if popery is thus triumphant, can nothing be done to change the aspect, or prevent the result which appears inevitable? We frankly reply, *Nothing*.

We have a duty to perform to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, and for its accomplishment we should exercise untiring zeal, if by any means we may save some of them. The light of the gospel should be constantly held up before them, and every means used to enlighten them on the true points at issue between the two parties. Let societies be instituted like the one recently organized in Boston, for the evangelization of Italy, but with another name and ob-

ject: "Evangelical Society for the promotion of the salvation of Roman Catholics." The evangelization of Italy is one of those things which will never be done. God has marked her for destruction, for she is drunken with the blood of the saints. But as in Jerusalem, in the days of her overthrow, he has a remnant who are to be sought and called out of her. Let all labour in this work, but make up their minds to do it at the risk of life, like the apostles of old.

---

### THE PROPHEPIC DESTINY OF ROME.

The London "Standard" does not hesitate to call the present, "*the eve of a great crisis for our common faith.*" In speaking of Prussia and her prospective overthrow, the *Standard* says, there will fly to her help "the whole host of infidel and socialist democracy throughout all Europe. Her death, then, if she shall die, will be a terrible one. It will be a death of furious convulsion and anarchy. It will be the death struggle of the satanic power in Europe. It will be so fearful, and even so far exceeding what we have before seen, that good men will wish to be removed from the scene of such bloody fury, when all the passions of hell will be brought up upon the stage of human existence, and war against every thing that is alike human and divine."

But who are to be the instruments of her ruin? The *Standard* says, "Germany and Denmark are absolutely fighting on the field of blood. France and Russia are in a state of forward preparation to enter the list against Germany. England is holding aloof till she may see which side she may best take, and Austria is prepared to back up the cause of Russia and France; and already marching in the full pomp and pride of war against her old and rancorous enemy, Prussia." The parties stand thus:—Prussia, at the head of the liberalists or democrats of Europe, embracing the protestant portion of Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy, together with the socialists of France. On the other side is Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Austria, Bavaria, Baden, France, Spain, Portugal, and

Naples. These are the leading kingdoms of Europe, leaving out Sardinia, which the pope has excommunicated and anathematized; and Prussia, the leading opponent of the coalition of monarchs. The contest between these two forces, the *Standard* calls, "A great and fearful contest between the powers of light and darkness." And it is in this light we view it. It is an array for which we have long looked; not, indeed, for the combination of the same nations which now seems to be developing itself; but yet for a *combination of kings* with the papacy, for the purpose of ending the spirit of revolution which shook all the thrones of Europe, and drove the pope into exile.

Baden, Bavaria and Portugal, are but insignificant kingdoms, but are most decidedly catholic, and ready for any enterprise in which they may render service to the church. Denmark and Sweden are nominally Protestant, but have a mixed population. Denmark is engaged in actual war with Germany, and will, as a matter of course, maintain her hostile attitude. Sweden is under the dictation of Russia, and in whatever way she is called on to act, she will fulfil the mandate. What course England will pursue remains yet to be seen. France is included in the category of kingdoms, notwithstanding her professed republicanism, because she takes the part of despotism against liberty, and is hastening rapidly back to a monarchy; and is the foremost in the support of the pope and overthrow of his opposers.

#### PREDICTIONS OF REVELATION, 17TH CHAPTER.

Whatever human speculations may be indulged, they are all liable to fail; but the revealed purposes of God will have their accomplishment.

The church of Rome calls herself "the kingdom of God." The Spirit of inspiration calls her "a scarlet coloured beast, with seven heads and ten horns." She calls Rome, the seat of her dominion, "the eternal city." The Spirit of inspiration calls her, "*the great whore; Mystery, Babylon the great,*" and declares that suddenly and with violence, she shall be thrown down, and be found no more at all.

*Rev. xvii. 1.* "Come hither, and I will show thee the judgment of the great whore."

Her judgment consists in the utter ruin which shall come upon her.

*Verse 3.* "So he carried me away in spirit into the wilderness, and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns."

Here we have the position of the woman or whore, on whom the judgment is to be executed, pointed out. She sits upon a beast. *Verse 7.* "The beast carried her." It is not the beast which she guides or rules, but on which she sits, and which carries her.

The character of the beast is also given. "Full of names of blasphemy." Such as "God on earth;"—"Our Lord God the Pope;"—"Most Holy Lord;"—"Holy Father," &c. These are all titles which the popes of Rome have received or appropriated to themselves."

*Verse 5.* "And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

Babylon, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, was the metropolis of the world, the seat of universal empire. This woman bears her name, because she is her successor in imperial dignity.

*Verse 6.* "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints," &c. "And when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration."

He was surprised at the appearance, and wondered what it signified.

*Verse 7.* "And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman and of the beast which carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns."



The promised explanation of these symbols is matter of great moment. Divine solutions of symbolical language, have always been given in literal language: and unless this is an exception, the explanations are to be understood literally. In view of this fact, we will attend to the explanations of the angel.

*Verse 8.* "The beast which thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit and go into perdition."

*A beast* is the symbol of a kingdom, as in Dan. vii. 17. "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth." *Verse 23.* "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth." These two verses establish the import of the symbol, and prove it to be a kingdom. "*The beast was.*" That is, he had one period of rule. "*And is not.*" He is overthrown, and for a season disappears and seems to be dead. "*And shall ascend out of the bottomless pit.*" He shall come again into power, as if sent from, and instigated by hell, to perform his great and last work. "*And go into perdition.*" His final destiny is, that he, in connexion with the false prophet, is to be "cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Rev. xix. 20.

Three of these particulars are true of the papacy. It was first established as the supreme power in the church, by the decrees of Justinian, emperor of Constantinople, in 533-4. Rome was conquered by the Greek armies, the Ostrogothic kingdom ended in Rome, and the pope left in supreme power under the protection of the eastern emperor, in 538. But this did not constitute him a temporal prince. Nor are temporalities essential to his character as a beast or government. In 755, Pepin, king of France, constituted him a temporal sovereign. From the conquest of the Ostrogoths in Rome, 538, to the conquest of Rome and abolition of the papal government by the French in 1798, the pope was the supreme power in Rome, constituting a reign of 1260 years.

Such was the extremity to which the pope was reduced,

that it seemed hardly possible for him ever to regain power over the nations of the earth.

But 1814 witnessed the liberation and restoration of the pope to his lost dominion. Since then, what has he not achieved?

“And all who dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, is not, and yet is.”

This beast, in his last appearance in power, is to be an object of universal wonder to all the inhabitants of earth, except to God’s true people.

Or, as recorded Rev. xiii. 7, 8. “It was given him to make war with the saints and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds and tongues and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.”

It is evident that the papacy is preparing for such a war against the protestant church, and anticipates such a triumph of the catholic church. Let all who value eternal life, and deprecate the lake of fire, beware how they yield to temptation. We are soon to find ourselves in the midst of the great trial.

“The language of the *Catholic Standard* is so appropriate, that we must adopt it as our own, by changing the word catholic to protestant.

“But would that all protestants throughout the world, were Protestants in heart and soul on the eve of this great crisis for our common faith! Would that among ourselves we had men of brass and iron, instead of stubble and straw.

“But the furnace of tribulation when it shall come, shall try us, and prove every man’s work of what it is. Thus shall the nations be winnowed, and the professors of every

faith be sifted, and the chaff shall be separated from the barley. And then, too, shall many that are now among the first, be proved among the last, and many whom we are now inclined to despise, no less Christian than ourselves."

*Verse 9.* "And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth."

The papal government, with brief exceptions, has supported the city of Rome since 538, A.D. That city is located on seven mountains, and is hence called the seven hilled city. This is geographically true of Rome. But this is not the only meaning of this hieroglyphic, *seven heads*.

*Verse 10.* "And there are seven kings; five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space."

*And these are seven kings.* These are usually understood as seven different forms of Roman government. To this we object, 1st. That there have not been seven forms of royal government. 2d. If we reckon all the different forms of Roman government, there are more than seven.

We therefore regard them as the great chain of gentile monarchies, which have led Israel captive, and reigned over and enslaved the people of God.

1. Assyria. 2. Chaldea. 3. Media. 4. Persia. 5. Grecia. These five had fallen in the days of John. One existed; imperial Rome. The other, the kingly barbarian power, had come, and when it did come, from the fall of the empire to the fall of the Ostrogoths, 476 to 538, there were 62 years, or a short space.

*Verse 11.* "And the beast, he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition."

The beast is the eighth head. Popery followed the barbarian kingdom of Rome, and is destined to be the last form of government in that ancient seat of power.

The reader will find in an article in this work, from the Catholic Standard, that it is there claimed that "the pope, for the first time in the history of the world, has been restored by the united action of the leading nations of Europe, to the *oldest throne in the world*." Either this is an empty boast, or it is older than the Chinese throne. And if so, it must date from the days of Nimrod, and he claims his right as the legitimate successor of the Assyrians downward. In this sense he is of the seven, or inherits their dominion. Like the Jews who confessed themselves the children of them that killed the prophets, they must reap the fruit of their father's sins. What is still more striking, the "Standard" claims that the government of the pope is *now universal*.

*Verse 12.* "The ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast."

These ten kings are not the original ten kings into which the Roman empire was divided. They are a combination of kings who shall agree and give their power and strength to the beast, and go with him to the last great battle. "*One hour*." Whether this signifies a definite period or an indefinite one, time will tell. It is most likely that it is indefinite, and means a period. They shall reign as kings at one time, or during one and the same period, with the beast.

*Verse 13.* "These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast."

They will enter into a league to support the pope against his own subjects. What ten they will be, it is not yet easy to determine. But circumstances seem likely to occur at no distant day which will make it manifest.

*Verse 14.* "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for he is King of kings, and Lord of lords; and they that are with him are called and chosen and faithful."



We commend this verse to the consideration of all, especially catholics. That whatever powers unite with the pope in the destruction of Rome, are the array which constitute the horns of the beast who will fight against the King of kings and his hosts at his appearing, is manifest.

*Verse 15.* "And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations and tongues."

Those waters represent all who lend their assistance to the support and aggrandizement of Rome, whether in their individual, official or national character. Some who do it are found in all nations.

*Verse 16.* "And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire."

This verse introduces us to the great object promised in the first verse, the judgment of the harlot. The instruments of her destruction are the ten kings in league with the beast or government which supports and carries the woman to be destroyed.

The relation between the pope and Roman people, is clearly expressed in a letter addressed by a committee of Italian patriots to the legislative assembly of France:

London, Thursday, Nov. 21, 1850.

*To the Representatives of the People in the Legislative Assembly:*—Gentlemen:—On the 31st of July, 1849, after two months' resistance, your troops took possession of Rome. The government of the Republic was overthrown.

They entered, you said, after the victory—for before you held another language—to protect the Pope against the yoke of Austrian intervention. Austria encamps, oppresses, slaughters men to-day in the Legations; it occupies at Bologna, it fortifies itself at Ancona.

They entered to restore peace to the Roman States.

Peace is a military partition, maintained by 25 or 30,000 foreign bayonets.

They entered to establish order, which had been troubled by what you call a *Faction*, to assure the Roman population of liberty and a good government. These were your promises, repeated at the tribune, registered in a dictatorial, and almost menacing letter of the President of France. And even the shade of liberty has now disappeared. Rome has nothing but an absolute, clerical government. Pius IX. has continued the spirit of Gregory XVI.

We said to you then, gentlemen, "You are deceived: The *faction* is Rome and its entire population. A *faction* is a minority, seeking to seize the power by intrigue or by terror. But to attain power the Republicans of Rome have awaited the almost unanimous expression of the people, legally convoked and represented. The Republic proclaimed by a constituent assembly, has been sanctioned by the spontaneous and pacific will of all the communes of the Roman States. Behold their names! Verify them. You see then that terror at Rome would have been not only criminal, but impossible. The terror, then, commences with you. It will not change the people, and it will obtain nothing from the Pope."

Well, gentlemen, for 18 months the *faction* has been vanquished, proscribed, imprisoned. The army dissolved itself; the National Guard has been dissolved. The reorganization of the State, from above, is complete. What have you obtained of the people? What have you obtained of the pope?

The people are sad, sombre and irritated. They hate and despise; and to restrain the people you are compelled to send more soldiers to your army of occupation.

The pope has accorded nothing. You demanded of him, you say, the principles of the statute, the laws of your civil code, a judiciary reform, a provincial and municipal organization founded upon election, an assembly deliberative in financial matters, an amnesty almost universal, the secularization of the administration.

He has given nothing. You affirmed that there would be no inquisitorial researches into the past. He has answered you by endless confiscations. You declared that you would not permit acts of personal violence before your eyes; and before your eyes, lately, for past political offences, six persons have been executed.

Behold, gentlemen, the results of the Roman expedition! Behold to what end you went to expend in the murder of a friendly people, the gold, the blood, and the honour of France.

Gentlemen, seventeen months since you might have been deceived. To-day, Europe tells you that France is alone deceived. France, whose initiative in the good cause threatens to perish at Rome; France, whose soldiers assist, arms in hand, at the saturnalias of a power which feels that it is dying, and who lend a strong hand to the execution of sentences of twenty years' imprisonment against young persons guilty of having illuminated their windows with tri-coloured lights!

Members of a National Committee, whose nucleus, elected by sixty members of the Assembly, which you dispersed with bayonets, completes itself by the election of a great number of Italian patriots, all inspired by the same thought, interpreters of the wishes of the Roman people, to-day forced to silence, we come, gentlemen, to renew before you, to France, the protestation of Rome against the violation of its territory; against the overthrow of its Republic; against the protracted occupation of your troops.

We protest in the name of the 5th article of your Constitution; in the name of your official declarations of the 10th, 24th and 26th April, 1849; in the name of the solemn vow pronounced the 7th May by your Assembly; in the name of the promise written the 13th June by M. Corcelles; in the name of the engagement contracted at the tribune by your President of the Council, and by your Ministers, during the sessions of the 13th, 18th and 19th October, 1849.

We protest in the name of the imperishable rights of nations—in the name of eternal justice—in the name of

the God who has created nations for liberty and not for oppression.

You can, gentlemen, suppress our protestation for a time, but you cannot refute it. We said to you, seventeen months ago: "Give the Roman people their right of voting, and let them express their sincere opinion of the government restored by you." We repeat it to you to-day—call the people to vote—they will justify us by their suffrages. Recall your troops, they will justify our words by insurrections.

You know this, gentlemen, and for that reason you will not do it.

For the National Italian Committee.

JOSEPH MAZZINI,

JOSEPH SIRTORI,

AURELIUS SAFFI,

A. SALICETI,

MATTEW MONTECCHI,

CES. AGOSTINE, Sec'y.

Such a spirit of resistance and rebellion can only be crushed by the destruction of place and people; and the allies and supporters of the pope are the ones to accomplish it. The ruin is to be sudden and entire, and to be by the action of fire.

*Verse 17.* "For God hath put into their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree and give their kingdom to the beast till the words of God shall be fulfilled."

Most suppose the destruction of the woman will also be the destruction of the beast. But this is incorrect. For the ten kings and the beast are to meet and resist Christ at his appearing and kingdom, Rev. xix. 19—21. It is not till then, that the words of God shall be fulfilled.

Again, whoever will read Rev. xiv. 8, and onward, will find that after the fall of "*that great city*," the beast will become an object of greater importance to the human race than ever before. Then will come the test question, whether the papacy is the kingdom of God as she professes, or whether that kingdom is to come from heaven with its king.

*Verse 18.* "And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth."



This confirms the entire exposition as being correct.

1. The great metropolis of earth was the city of Rome.
2. She sits on seven hills or mountains.
3. She is and has been supported by the papacy for these 1300 years.
4. The Roman people are so rebellious against the papacy, as to require the interference of the European powers to support him against their power.

And the mighty array of warlike armies, for the purpose of destroying the spirit of republicanism, and rebellion against despotism, gives reason to anticipate the speedy destruction of that great city. Then will great voices in heaven, sing, ALLELUIA.

---

### THE APOSTACY—THE MAN OF SIN.

The diversity of views respecting *the man of sin* is great. The prevailing sentiment among Protestants is, that he is the Papacy, as a system. Others maintain that it signifies an individual who will arise and deny the being of a God, and give himself up to work all manner of evil to a degree hitherto unknown. This is in substance the belief of Roman Catholics.

It is probable there is some truth in each of these theories, while neither is entirely correct, or rather, presents the whole truth on the subject.

The apostacy and revelation of the man of sin are precursors of the coming of Christ "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." He cannot come until the falling away, or the apostacy, and the revelation of the man of sin have taken place.

2 Thess. ii. 3. "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, 'the son of perdition.'"

We will consider—

I. *What is implied by the apostacy or falling away.* The word rendered "*falling away*," is *apostasias*, a rebellion or revolt from lawful authority, as subjects from their rulers, or soldiers from their officers. It is used,

Acts xx. 21. "To *forsake* Moses;"—*revolt* from the law of Moses, and not to circumcise their children.

The word occurs 1 Tim. iv. 1. "Some shall depart (apostatize) from the faith." The idea of a revolt or rebellion is kept up in this verse. And it is in this sense the Church of Rome understand the word to be used, in 2 Thess. ii. 3. They apply it to a revolt or rebellion from the Roman government. They maintain that it was partly accomplished by the Reformation under Martin Luther; when so many nations broke with Rome and threw off her yoke, but is to have a more full accomplishment in the future, when there will be an entire defection from the Roman government.

It must be confessed that there is a degree of plausibility in the interpretation of the passage. And judging from the present relations subsisting between the Pope and his people, it would not be strange if such an event were soon to transpire.

And the idea will gather strength, if we consider that the ten horns in league with the beast are to be provoked, by some means, to destroy Rome. What but a revolt against his holiness would be likely to produce such a result?

"*Man of sin*"—"Son of perdition." These two names belong to one person or system; the latter name being explanatory of the former. This explanatory clause identifies the "man of sin" with the beast having seven heads and ten horns. Of him it is said, Rev. xvii. 8, "The beast which thou sawest was and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit and go into *perdition*." The perdition to which he is destined is the lake of fire and brimstone, Rev. xix. 20.

Another mark of identity is, their works are the same. Of the son of perdition, it is said, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. ii. 4. The description given of the beast, Rev. xiii. 6, is, that "He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven."

This common blasphemy constitutes a strong mark of identity.

## II. THE REVELATION OF THE MAN OF SIN.

The revelation, not the origination, of the man of sin, follows the apostacy or rebellion. "Except there come the apostacy first, and that man of sin be *revealed*."

We have seen in a former article, that the full development of the beast's power will be after the destruction of Rome by the ten kings. Verse seventh teaches us that the germ of this man of sin was in existence in the apostolic age. "Now ye know what withholdeth, that he (the man of sin) might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let (or hinder his revelation) until he be taken out of the way; and then shall that wicked be revealed."

That which withholdeth, has usually been considered by Protestants to be the Roman Empire. And this seems to have been the opinion of the early fathers.

Tertullian thus speaks on the subject. "We Christians are under a particular necessity of praying for the emperors, and for the continued state of the empire; because we know that dreadful power which hangs over the whole world is retarded by the continuance of the time appointed for the Roman Empire." Apol. p. 31.

The fathers probably obtained their views from the predictions of Daniel, concerning the little horn, the successor or appendage of the fourth beast, or Roman empire. But it should be remembered that the fourth beast is not represented as being ended when the ten horns came up. But the "beast had ten horns;" and among them "there came up another little horn." Dan. vii.

The vision continued till the sitting of the judgment. "I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even, till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame." Verse 21. "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them till the Ancient of Days came." From these verses we learn that the little horn will survive the beast, and speak great

words, and wear out the saints till the Lord comes. That is, the temporal government of Rome will be ended, and its very location burnt with fire. Still the Papacy will continue to make war on the saints and prevail till the coming of the Lord.

---

## THE TRUE ISSUE BETWEEN POPERY AND PROTESTANTISM.

In what form, it will be asked, did the mystery of iniquity work in the days of Paul? We reply, it assumed the same position which the church of Rome now assumes—*“That the Christian church, founded by Christ and the apostles, was the kingdom of God on earth.”* This is the true issue between Protestantism and Popery; it is the point which will be made prominent in the great conflict between the powers of light and darkness. That this error had crept into the Corinthian church, is evident from the severe reproofs and warnings of the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. iv. All he wished them to account the apostles was, “ministers of Christ,” verse i. So far from being a judge, he did not even “judge himself.” Verse 3.

Verse 6. He transferred these things to himself and Apollos, that the church might learn in them “not to think of men above that which is written, that no one be puffed up for one, against another.”

Verse 8th commences a strain of most cutting irony, scarcely equalled in the Sacred Scriptures, even by Elijah when he proved the prophets of Baal.

“Now ye are full! now ye are rich! ye have reigned as kings! without us. I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you.” I have placed exclamation points in the foregoing text to bring out with greater force the ironical contrast instituted by Paul between the real state of the apostles and the boasted reign of the church.

Verses 9, 10, continue the contrast between the *boast* and the *reality*. Verses 11—13, present in a striking light the condition of the apostles. Verse 14 assigns the reason why he indulges in such a strain; not to shame, but to warn them, as his beloved children. Well would it have been,



had the church always heeded the warning, and never suffered the doctrine to find a resting-place, that "the church is the reigning kingdom of God."

Verse 18. "Now some are puffed up, as though I would not come to you!" As though they had so far advanced beyond the apostolic idea, and had so far disregarded his teachings, that he would scarcely dare make his appearance among them.

Verse 19. "But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will;—and will know, not the *speech*, but the *power* of them that are puffed up," or think they are reigning in the kingdom of God.

Verse 20. "For the kingdom of God is not in (does not consist in) words, but in power." If they were really the kingdom of God, they would manifest it by the power they possessed. If they did not show some other proof than mere words, it would be conclusive evidence they did not reign.

Chap. v. 1. He adopts another strain, pointing out the gross immorality in the church, such even as the Gentiles would not name!—"That one should have his father's wife!" "And you are puffed up!" Is not Rome, who makes the same boast, equally corrupt as a church? Is Protestantism clear? This will be sufficient to show that the "mystery of iniquity" was then working, and was pointedly rebuked by Paul. For it he had no fellowship.

Popery claims that the Christian church is the kingdom of God on earth; that the primacy, with the keys, was given to Peter; that Peter was the first bishop of Rome; that there has been an unbroken succession of bishops in Rome, to whom the keys have descended, and hence that the Roman church is the true kingdom of God, and all who do not acknowledge the claim are either heretics or schismatics. Here is a great difficulty:—It has not yet been proved that Peter was ever in Rome, or was ever bishop of Rome, much less that he was a monarch there. He was at Jerusalem; he opened the gospel ministry there.

While the Pope remains in Rome he can never substantiate his claim to be the successor of St. Peter. While he is monarch of Rome, he is identified with the monsters of

prophetic visions. He presents to the world an obstacle to his own triumph.

There are two objects with Romanists to be accomplished: 1. To end Rome, and the temporal government of Rome, and be rid of the incubus. 2. That the church, or Roman Catholic powers under the Pope, should be the instruments of its destruction. If that can be done, they will point to Dan. ii., to prove that the fourth empire is broken, and that the church and her allies were the instrument; and hence, the church must be the kingdom of God symbolized by the stone. This will constitute an argument which will convert millions to Popery.

This done, there will be another end to be reached. God's chosen rest and seat of royal power is Zion or Jerusalem, not Rome. A throne in Jerusalem, not as a temporal monarch, but as the head of the universal kingdom of God, will be all-important. There was Peter's bishopric and seat. Then the man of sin will be revealed in his true character as antichrist, attempting to reign in the kingdom of Christ, in opposition to Christ's personal and visible reign. "He, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Whether it will be in the Mosque of Omar on Mount Moriah, or a temple to be erected for the purpose, in the holy city, we cannot say. But his coming will be like "the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. For this cause God shall send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

The strong delusion will be—1. The communications of spirits, teaching that the man of sin is God, with other infidel doctrines. 2. The performance of great miracles by diabolical agency, as foretold by Christ, Matt. xxiv. They shall deceive, if possible, the very elect.

These deceptions are to be sent, because those who are the subjects of them "received not *the love of the truth*." It is not "because they did not understand all the truth,

but "because they had not a love for it," did not desire it. "For this cause God shall send," &c. With what assiduity, then, should we cultivate a love for the truth; we should search for it as for hid treasures, if we would escape the fatal snare.

#### THE ONLY HOPE OF DELIVERANCE.

The picture, dark as it is, has its bright side. There is a door of hope opened to the church of Christ, the "little flock:" it does not consist in the conversion of the world, as Rev. Joseph Benson, in the following passage in his commentary on the text, suggests. Referring to Dan. vii. 27, he says—"A prediction which undoubtedly signifies the general conversion of both Jews and Gentiles to the Christian faith." How unlike the apostle's faith! "Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy by the brightness of his coming." Such is the divine purpose; and until that glorious event, the man of sin will continue his desolating war against the saints, and prevail also. Our Father, let "thy kingdom come." How any one can, with the Word of God open before him, entertain a hope of the overthrow of the man of sin, the beast, the little horn, &c., before the coming of Christ, is truly marvellous.

Nor can we close this part of our subject without reverting once more to the subject of the nature of the kingdom of God on earth, as foretold by the prophets. We repeat it, this is the true issue between Popery and Protestantism; and while Protestants yield this point, they will be weak and like other men. The reign of Christ on earth is personal; his coming and kingdom are at the judgment. When he comes in the clouds of heaven, according to Dan. vii. 13, 14, he is to receive the kingdom. When the seventh trumpet sounds, according to Rev. xi. 15, the kingdoms of this world are to "become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ." When the nobleman, who has gone to a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return, comes, having received his kingdom, then he will reign on earth, and his dominion be from sea to sea.

But the conflict for dominion will be desperate. The

scenes of the 2d Psalm, the 110th Psalm, and Isaiah lxiii., and Revelation 19, are all to transpire in that eventful day. All the hosts of earth will be combined against our Lord, and array their hosts to resist him. But they shall be broken "with a rod of iron, and dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel." The beast shall be cast alive into the lake of fire, and the remnant slain.

### FUTURE PUNISHMENT—DOOM OF THE WICKED.

"The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, by H. H. Dobney." Mr. Dobney, the author of this work, is a Baptist minister in England. The work consists of two parts. *Part first* maintains the doctrine of future punishment, against the sentiments of Universalism, and is an able production. *Part second* discusses the question of the character and duration of the punishment of the wicked, maintaining that it will consist in *utter destruction*, or, in other words, *entire extinction of conscious being*. It is regarded by the advocates of that theory as the best work extant on the end of the wicked. The spirit of kindness and Christian candour manifested in this work, is worthy of imitation by all controversialists.

Mr. H. A. Chittenden, of New York, presented us with a copy of the above named work, with a request to write him our opinion of its merits. In accordance with this request and our promise, we have written the following review, in the form of a letter addressed to Mr. C. These remarks will explain the reasons of the form in which the Review appears.

REVIEW OF MR. DOBNEY ON THE END OF THE WICKED.

TO H. A. CHITTENDEN:

*Dear Brother,*—I now proceed to fulfil my promise made to you when you presented me a copy of Mr. Dob-



ney's work on future punishment, that I would inform you, in writing, of my estimate of the work. I have given it a thorough, and, I trust, candid examination, such as a subject of so great magnitude demands, and with a sincere desire to know the truth. There is no doctrine which would more accord with my sympathies than that advocated in part second, (unless it be Universalism,) could I be persuaded that it was in accordance with the revealed purposes of God. On the other hand, there is none which fills me with more fearful apprehension, in view of teaching such a doctrine, if it is a perversion of the Word of God, as I am constrained to regard it. To lower down, or palliate the terrible threatenings with which infinite wisdom and goodness has seen it important to fill the Bible, is to incur no small amount of responsibility. Had they not been important in order to promote the great designs of infinite love, we may rest assured they would not have been left on record. To tell the sinner that the "*eternal punishment*" in "*eternal fire*," which the Judge of all the earth has declared he will award to the wicked, is extinction of conscious being, I confess, is taking a responsibility at which I shudder, and which it will require stronger arguments than I have ever yet seen, to induce me to incur. Let the threatenings stand in all their naked terror, as they came from the pen of inspiration: then, if they mean all they express on the face of them, the sinner will be without excuse; if they mean less, he will lose nothing.

*To part first*, of course, I do not in general object.

To part second I have many objections, too many to be noticed in the limits which my pages will afford me. I shall, therefore, select some of the more prominent and leading points, and present my reasons for dissenting from them.

Mr. D. says, p. 90:—

"Our inquiry may proceed thus:

"1. *Can reason (independently of revelation) prove man to be immortal?*

"And if not—

"2. *Does Scripture teach that immortality is the absolute and inalienable portion of every man? Of man, that is, as man?"*

To the the first question I answer, *No*.  
The second requires a full investigation.

*Immortality defined.*

Mr. D., p. 92, thus defines the terms immortal and immortality:

“By *immortal*, then, is meant one who will live for ever; and by *immortality*, never-ending existence. He is immortal, not, who *might have lived* for ever, but for certain reasons will not, but only he who positively *shall live* for ever.”

Mr. D. quotes various lexicographers in proof of the correctness of his definitions. I object neither to his nor their definitions as being sufficient for all popular uses. Nor would I object to discuss the subject as Mr. D. has defined the terms, were it not for the fact that the Scriptures are the authority to which our appeal is in all cases to be made to decide the truth or falsity of our respective positions.

And as I conceive Mr. D.'s definition does not fully express the *scriptural* import of the words, I appeal from him to them.

Mr. Dobney and most others confound the idea of an eternal state of conscious existence in the future, with *immortality*. I object to this as being unwarranted by Scripture. If we are to discuss and decide scriptural doctrines, we must have scriptural definitions of their terms; popular definitions are not sufficiently accurate for such purpose. Nearly all writers use some words in an arbitrary sense, and are perfectly justified in doing so, provided they by some means inform the reader what sense they attach to these words. This remark holds good with the writers of the Bible.

The inspired penmen have used two Greek words, each of which our English translators have rendered by one English word, *immortality*.

1. *Athanasia*. This word is used only three times in the New Testament. 1 Tim. vi. 16: “Who only hath *immortality*, dwelling in the light.” This is affirmed of Jesus Christ, and is said to be an attribute which he *alone*

possessed. It does not belong even to the angels, although they cannot die. Luke xx. 36.

It is not applied in Scripture to a purely spiritual existence of any description, not even to the Godhead itself, as such. It belongs to Jesus Christ in *his human flesh, quickened by the Spirit of God and glorified*. This appears from the context: "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality." My former view of the text was, that it referred to the eternity of the Godhead; but a more mature examination of the text and context has satisfied me that Christ, as our glorified and coming king, is the subject of the remark.

The other two instances of the use of the word are 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54: "This mortal must put on *immortality*;" "This mortal shall have put on *immortality*." In these two texts the (*Athanasia*) *immortality*, is affirmed of all the saints, who will be raised from the dead, and glorified at the second advent of Christ. Their "*mortal bodies*" are to be quickened by the same Spirit which raised up Jesus from the dead.

"So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 8, 11.

This text is clear and forcible; it teaches that the mortality of man pertains to the body, and not to the spirit. It is the body which is mortal, and it is the mortal body which shall be quickened. There is one point which is overlooked by all who have written on the subject, so far as I am acquainted; and that is, that a purely spiritual nature is not, in one solitary instance, said to possess immortality, in the sense of "*athanasia*," or deathlessness. Both mortality and immortality are affirmed of human flesh, not of spirit, in one instance. We are not at liberty,

therefore, to use the terms in reference to spirits of any grade, whether good or bad, not God himself, neither the angels, although they cannot die. I earnestly invite the candid consideration of this circumstance by all who read these pages. I take it for granted that all who take the pains to peruse this review earnestly desire to know the truth, and I humbly believe this position is founded on the plain testimony of Scripture, and cannot be successfully controverted. If the position is correct, it must essentially modify the subject of discussion on both sides. I ask for nothing in this discussion but what is just, sound, and scriptural; and I trust my opponents are not so wedded to their theory as to be unwilling to grant that, even if it should bear heavily against their favourite views.

Permit me to state the position once more, and bring it out prominently, that it may be distinctly understood.

*The Greek word ATHANASIA, rendered IMMORTALITY, is only ascribed to glorified human flesh quickened by the Spirit of God into eternal life.* Neither mortality nor immortality is ascribed to God as a spirit, to angels who are spirits, nor to the spirits of men, whether good or bad. The answer to the question before us, therefore, is—If by immortality you mean that which is expressed by the Greek word *αθανασία*, No. For the Scriptures neither apply it to God, angels, nor the spirits of men, nor yet to men as such, but to glorified human flesh alone. The body is called “mortal,” the spirit is not: “This mortal must put on immortality.”

*Αφθαρσία, Aphtharsia*, with the adjective *Aphthartos*, are the other Greek words sometimes improperly or only by implication rendered *immortality* and immortal. The true meaning is, incorruptibility, not subject to corruption or decay, or decomposition. 1. It is applied to God, Rom. i. 23: “The incorruptible God.” 2. It is applied to man, Rom. ii. 7: “To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life.” 3. It is applied to moral affections, Eph. vi. 24: “Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in *sincerity*.” Also, Titus ii. 7; it is rendered *sincerity*, moral incorruption. The word here rendered



sincerity is the same as that rendered immortality, Rom. ii. 7. 4. It is applied (1 Pet. i. 4) to inanimate substance, the inheritance of the saints, the new or heavenly Jerusalem. "To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." The word, therefore, as used in Scripture, does not necessarily imply life or animate and conscious existence at all; but simply a quality of incorruptibility, whether of spiritual or physical substance; or whether animate or inanimate beings, and also it is expressive of moral purity. 1 Tim. i. 17. Instead of translating this text, as it now reads, "king eternal, *immortal*," it should be rendered "eternal, incorruptible," &c. Instead of reading, "hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," it would be more truly translated, "brought life and *incorruptibility* to light," &c.

It is correctly rendered in these texts: 1 Cor. xv. 42—"Raised in incorruption;" verse 50—"Neither doth corruption inherit *incorruption*;" verses 53, 54—"Must put on incorruption;" "Shall have put on incorruption." Had the same rendering observed in these last four texts been uniformly followed in translating the word, it would have prevented the confusion of ideas which now exists on the subject of scriptural immortality. I would not be understood as charging my opponents with any more culpability in this matter than their more orthodox antagonists. All have been too negligent in this matter of tracing the real scriptural import of the terms, and have contented themselves with using the terms according to their popular definition.

My final answer to the question at issue, in view of the foregoing scriptural use of the words Aphtharsia and Aphthartos is, that the Scriptures do not teach that man, as such, consisting of soul, body, and spirit, is incorruptible, but the reverse. He is spoken of now as corruptible; and hence, at the resurrection, the saints shall put off "*this corruptible*," and "put on incorruption." But men, all men, are now corruptible, or liable to decay or decomposition, and cannot therefore be said to be incorruptible, and the wicked have no promise of an incorruptible body at the resurrection. Thus, you will perceive, I

have answered both Mr. Dobney's questions in the negative, and am now prepared to state the true questions.

I. *Does Scripture teach that man has an intelligent spirit which exists in consciousness after death?*

II. *Does Scripture teach that the wicked will, in some form, exist eternally in conscious torment?*

These two questions are unambiguous, and bring the true points at issue before us.

On both these questions Mr. Dobney takes the negative, and I shall take the positive.

I. Does Scripture teach that man has an intelligent spirit which exists in consciousness after death?

Mr. Dobney remarks, p. 137: "The Scriptures nowhere represent any of the human race as consciously existent in a perfectly disembodied state, as naked spirits." This position is open and frank, and we are at once brought to the discussion of the point. But that I may not misrepresent him, I will quote the next section.

"Nor do the Scriptures ever speak of three successive bodily states of man. They only recognise the present body and the resurrection body; *σωμα ψυχικον*, the animal body or soul body, and *σωμα πνευματικον*, the spiritual or spirit body." This settles the point, and establishes the fact that he assumes the negative position on the question at issue.

In justification of his position he refers us to the appearance of Moses, with Christ and Elijah, on Mount Tabor. "Moses died and was buried; yet he appeared on Tabor with Elijah, and he was visible, or embodied." Now it appears to me that Mr. Dobney was most unfortunate in the selection of such a case to prove his position, unless he can prove that the resurrection takes place at death. It is true, Moses did appear on Tabor with Elijah, and that he was visible; but that he was therefore *embodied*, does not follow.

The confounding of the idea of visibility and embodiment, is erroneous, if by embodiment is meant that the spirit must take to itself a body of substance foreign to itself. But if it only means, that it assumes a visible form, of its own substance, resembling the fleshly body it

has left, I do not object to it. But Mr. D. evidently intended to impress upon his readers the idea that Moses was there in his resurrection body.

In p. 136, the writer more than hints that there will be an entire destruction or extinction of the present body; and that the resurrection body will not have "bone and muscle," &c. Is it not manifest that Mr. D. wholly mistakes the import of the text he quotes? He infers from the text, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," that there can be neither bone nor muscle in a glorified saint. But this is contrary to the pattern or sample of first fruits. Christ our head, after his resurrection, said, "Handle me, and see: a spirit has not flesh and bones, as you see me have." A resurrection and immortal body has bone and muscle; but being quickened by the Spirit of God is called a spiritual body. It is surprising that Mr. Dobney should have overlooked so positive a testimony as this, as to the materiality of the resurrection body.

Again, it is somewhat remarkable that he did not recollect that Christ "should be the first that should rise from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." And as the appearance of Moses on Tabor was before the resurrection of Christ, it is clear that Moses had not a resurrection body; for had he been raised from the dead, Christ would not have been the first. And as Mr. D. truly says, the Scriptures only speak of two bodies, the present body, and the resurrection body, it follows, that Moses must have been there as "*a naked spirit.*"

#### APPARENT DISINGENUOUSNESS OF MR. DOBNEY.

It is evident from this passage in Mr. Dobney's work, as well as some others, that he was a full believer in Professor Bush's theory of the resurrection; notwithstanding he endeavours to evade the fact. Yet his whole argument, as far as the state of man after death is concerned, is predicated on that doctrine. I regret the apparent disingenuousness of his predicating an argument on a doctrine, and then concealing the fact that he believes it.

It is only on the hypothesis that the resurrection takes place at death, that he can dispose of the fact that Moses

appeared on Tabor; or that Dives, Lazarus and Abraham were represented as conscious after death; and that Christ promised the dying thief that he should that day be with him in Paradise. He frankly acknowledges that the ordinary method of Destructionists of explaining those points is scarcely satisfactory. See p. 142. But as he has not thought proper to discuss that doctrine, I will pass it over by merely calling attention to the circumstance of the importance of Prof. Bush's theory for the support of his propositions. Without it several of them fall to the ground; and among others, the one which affirms that Moses was present on Tabor, embodied, i. e. in his resurrection body. And if this is not true, he was there *disembodied*, and my position is sustained; and the spirit does exist in consciousness after death. The appearance of Moses on Tabor cannot be explained on any other just principle of interpretation.

And as this circumstance, together with a reference to Dives and Lazarus, on which he lays no stress, constitutes the sum of Mr. D's argument on this point, I shall be under the necessity of pursuing the subject as an independent argument.

For whether the first question, as I have stated it, is an important one to be established in order to the full elucidation of his subject or not, it is with me all-important. A mere affirmation, that "the scriptures nowhere represent any of the human race as consciously existent in a perfectly disembodied state, as naked spirits," is not sufficient to settle a question of so great magnitude as the one he discusses. It is in fact the great point on which the whole controversy turns.

#### IMPORTANT POINT—CONSIDER THIS ATTENTIVELY.

For if it can be proved from scripture that death does not extinguish the conscious existence of the spirit of man, the whole controversy is at an end. The doctrine of the utter destruction of the wicked, in the sense of extinction of conscious being, depends on the meaning of the words *death*, *destroyed*, *destruction*, *consume*, *devoured*, *perish*, *perished*. All these terms are used to express the idea of death, tem-



poral death. If it can be shown that temporal death is not an extinction of conscious being, then these terms, any one or all of them, being applied to the doom of the wicked, do not prove his conscious being ended. For these terms, applied to his final destiny, cannot be made to mean any more than they do when used in reference to temporal death. If the first death does not destroy the spirit's consciousness, there can be no evidence that the second death will do it. I regard the omission of the discussion of this point by Mr. D., as a fundamental omission, rendering invalid his whole argument.

*I submit this position as invulnerable.*

I shall therefore proceed to prove the spirit's consciousness after death.

*The revealed nature of man warrants the belief.* An appeal to the history of man's creation, as recorded in Gen. ii., and to the history of his sentence, Gen. iii., have been considered by materialists as a sufficient solution of the two problems, man's nature and doom. They have been urged, over and over, as proving the entire man to be formed of dust, and that death necessarily restores him to dust:—this is urged with pertinacity, as though it embraced all God has seen fit to reveal on the subject of man's nature and the phenomenon of death. Of this fact, those who have been attentive observers of this controversy must be perfectly aware. But is it just? I ask it earnestly and sincerely. Is it just? Is there nothing additional revealed on these two points? You know full well there is. You know the great Creator who has revealed, Gen. iii., that he formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into him the breath of life, has also revealed, Zech. xii., that he, the same who created the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth, "formeth the spirit of man within him."

Are we not as much bound to admit this part of God's revelation concerning the formation of man's spirit, as we are that which relates to the formation of the body? It is because he is the former of the spirit of man, not *with* the body, which is of dust, but *within* him, that he is called "the God of the spirits of all flesh." Numb. xvi. 22;

xxvii. 16. "For God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." When, therefore, Moses calls God the "God of the spirits of all flesh," he recognises and proves the living existence of the spirits of all flesh, according to our Saviour's argument. But it is frequently urged, that "the possession of a soul and spirit is affirmed of all the beast, bird, reptile and insect creatures; as well as all that move in the sea." I freely grant all this:—but what have materialists gained by the admission? Not any thing. If they will give me one plain text of scripture in proof, I will believe in the conscious existence of their spirits after death, as firmly as I do in their possession of a spirit while living. If they will give me any proof from scripture that the intelligence of brutes pertains to their spirits, I will believe that. But as the Bible does not affirm either, I have no religious faith on either point.

And whether man knows the difference between "the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of a beast which goeth downward to the earth," or not, the scriptures have revealed that concerning man's spirit which they have not of the spirits of beasts.

The word of God declares man's intelligence pertains to the spirit.

1. 1 Cor. ii. 11. "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." Here we have the intelligence or rationality of the spirit of man set forth in express terms, and illustrated by comparison with the divine intelligence. No such rationality is ever affirmed of the spirit of beasts.

2. Another revelation of the same fact is made Rom. viii. 16. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Here again the human spirit is represented as the medium of communication between God and man. It is, therefore, the rational part of man.

3. Once more, it is the medium of the divine connexion with man. 1 Cor. vi. 17. "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." The Christian is thus one spirit with the Lord. The prayer of Paul for the Ephe-

sian church is to the same purport. To be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man. No intelligence, nor divine union, nor communion is ever affirmed of brute spirits.

4. There is another pre-eminence which man has above the beasts. When death supervenes, and the dust returns to the earth as it was, in the case of man, his spirit returns to God who gave it. But this is not affirmed of beasts. Eccl. xii. 7.

5. The spirits of just men are affirmed to be in the Heavenly Jerusalem, in the same city of the living God where the angels are and where Jesus Christ is. This is nowhere affirmed of brutes. Heb. xii. 23.

6. Of human beings it is said that the dead shall be judged like men in the flesh, but live like God in spirit. 1 Pet. iv. 6. No such thing is ever affirmed of the spirits of brutes. I might extend this train of thought and quotation indefinitely, but these points will be sufficient to show a great pre-eminence of men over beasts; if not in the fact of all having one breath, and all being of the dust and all returning to dust, yet in the one possessing a rational intelligent spirit, with which God unites himself; to which he communicates; which returns to God.

The evidence of the existence of Man's spiritual nature after death is abundant. The Scriptures use the term spirit to signify the intelligent principle or agent in man; the term soul for the living principle. But these principles being both spiritual in their nature, are used interchangeably, the one for the other.

The language of our Saviour is explicit with regard to the existence of the soul in life after the death of the man, as man. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Matth. x. 28. If there is meaning in language, this teaches plainly that the body may die and the soul survive. Nay, more:—That it is impossible for man to kill the soul. But if the soul dies with the body, it is impossible for man to kill the body without killing the soul.

I am aware of the evasion which is usually resorted to on this text; that the soul means life in this text; and has

reference to the eternal life promised to those who lose their life for Christ's sake. To this I reply that those who resort to the explanation will not abide by it. Let us read the text with this exegesis. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the eternal life: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both eternal life and body in hell." Who does not at once perceive the absurdity of the position, that he is able to destroy the eternal life in hell?

It is further urged, that the Saviour teaches that God is able to destroy the soul. This I grant, either in the scriptural sense, as he is to destroy the devil, by tormenting him in fire and brimstone for ever and ever, day and night, or by annihilation. But this does not prove that the soul dies with the body, nor yet that man can kill it. With a candid and unbiassed mind, I might safely leave the argument here. There is something of man alive after his body is dead. When I hear men, as I frequently have done, boldly affirm that there is not one word in the Bible which teaches the existence of the soul or spirit after death, I can but inwardly ask, "Poor man, in what dark heathen country have you lived, where they have not received so much as the first ten chapters of the Gospel?" But seriously, it is really one of the most ridiculous theological positions in which a man can place himself.

The language of Peter is equally explicit, 1 Pet. iv. 5, 6. "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For, for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead; that they might be judged like men in the flesh, but live like God in the spirit."

I use the word like, in the foregoing text, because it expresses the idea more forcibly than "according to," or "in likeness of." There is no other rational meaning to be attached to it, than the one here brought out, or, if there is, I have never had the good fortune to meet with it.

The text teaches us that men will be brought to trial while dead, and be judged like men in flesh, but live like God in spirit. Materialists can throw this away as an interpolation, or refuse to look at it and give it its full force, but can never meet it.



There is no obscurity in the passage but what erroneous theories produce. In itself, it is plain. But to those whose theory teaches that the general judgment or trial of the human race follows the general resurrection, of course there is great obscurity. So also with those who believe the Spirit of Man to be his *wind*, and that at death, it becomes extinct, there is great obscurity. But to one who believes that **THE DEAD**, small and great, will stand before God, and the books be opened and **THE DEAD** be judged, &c., all is plain; no language could be more so. *You*, my brother, will see this. Whether you will confess it or not, I cannot say.

I have now proved, by the highest authority, Jesus Christ and the Apostle Peter, that both soul and spirit do live after death.

We have also considered one case of the open visible appearance of a man who was dead and buried, and before he could have been raised from the dead, if Christ was the first that should rise. These three texts are neither of them of doubtful character, but directly to the point; this you must confess.

Have the candour, then, my brother, to meet and dispose of them in a perfectly satisfactory manner, or suspend your judgment on the question at issue till you can. It is not wise, rashly to persist in the maintenance of a position, when evidence is against it.

You will perhaps say, "The texts you have adduced, although very pointed in proof of the living existence of the soul and spirit after death, are no more plain than the declaration of the wise man, 'The dead know not any thing.'" If this is plain, it is no more plain and positive than the following clause: "Neither have they any more a reward." Why is this last clause never quoted, when the first is so constantly pressed into service? If the one clause is to have its most obvious import, no good reason can be urged why the other should not. Then we have the *late* doctrine of Dr. Walsh fully established, that death is the final and utter end of the wicked. That for them there is no judgment, no resurrection, no future punish-

ment. Neither is your clause of the text any more positive than this, in the same passage: "Neither have they any more a portion for ever, in any thing that is done under the sun." The text, if it proves any thing, proves too much, and is therefore good for nothing for your purpose. No man, if he acts wisely, will ever set a text of so doubtful a character against a plain and positive declaration of Christ, such as we have in Matt. x. 28.

You must confess the plain scriptural account of the phenomenon of death to be, that of a separation of soul and spirit from the body. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." "The body without the spirit is dead." The dead "live like God in spirit." This presents the phenomenon of death and place and state of the parts of man in death.

Mr. Dobney's remark, page 139, that "However shadowy the forms which tenant the elysian fields of the popular theology, it is beyond dispute that each blessed inhabitant of paradise is conceived and spoken of as *already* possessed of a spiritual body."

To this I reply, I have nothing to do with the popular theology, and do not hold myself responsible for its teachings. The text I have presented in proof of the living existence of the spirit of the dead, neither conceives nor speaks of them as having a spiritual body; but represents the *dead*, not those living in a resurrection body, but the *dead*, as living "like God, in spirit."

My faith rests, not on popular theology, but on the testimony of Scripture.

In further confirmation of this view, I refer to the fact, that it was the established faith of the Pharisees of the days of Christ, with which the disciples agreed, that the spirit did exist after death, as a spirit, and in that character was sometimes visible. When Christ, after his resurrection, appeared to his disciples, "They were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." How did Christ re-assure them? Was it by telling them there is no such thing as a *naked spirit*? By no means;

but he said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see, for A SPIRIT has not flesh and bones as ye see me have." His was a resurrection body. This is indisputable, and yet it was flesh and bones. This belief the disciples held in connexion with the pharisees. For of their faith Paul declared himself; and Christ declared their teachings correct, but their practice wrong. Matt. xxiii. 3: Acts xxiii. 6—9: "But when Paul perceived that the one part were sadducees, and the other pharisees, he cried out in council, Men and brethren, I am a pharisee, the son of a pharisee: of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the pharisees and the sadducees: and the multitude was divided. For the sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: but the pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God." From this it is clear that they believed in spirits other than angels, and that those spirits did sometimes communicate with men. In addition to this existence of spirits and angels, they believed in a resurrection. In accordance with this faith of Paul, he expressed his full confidence and knowledge, that while "at home in the body," he was "absent from the Lord:" and when "absent from the body, present with the Lord;" for this he was willing. But there was another thing for which he groaned and earnestly longed: it was "to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven;" and also "that mortality might be swallowed up of life." He was willing for the intermediate state, or, in other words, to be "absent from the body, and present with the Lord;" but earnestly desired the resurrection. Both these states were embraced in the faith of the pharisees, of which faith Paul declared himself, and are here expressed as his own confidence, faith and knowledge on the point.

Is it not fair to interpret his writings by his declared faith? If so, then my interpretation of the fifth chapter of second Corinthians, is correct. Had he ever taken an



exception to any part of the faith of the pharisees as summed up in the text quoted, we would be obliged to consider it in the interpretation of his language elsewhere. But this he never did. Neither Christ nor any one of his apostles ever intimated the unconsciousness of the *spirit* of man in death. But they did say much the reverse of it.

THE RIGHTEOUS DEAD PERISH WITHOUT A RESURRECTION.  
MEANING OF PERISH.

In opposition to my last position, that neither Christ nor any one of the Apostles ever taught the doctrine of the unconsciousness of man's spirit in death,—1 Cor. xv. 18, is presented. "Then (if there be no resurrection of the dead,) they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." As this is a seeming contradiction of my position, I will give it a fair and full examination.

On this text Mr. Dobney remarks, p. 149:—

"The entire scope of the argument shows that it is in this sense he uses the word perished." "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, and ye are yet in your sins: *then* they also who are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED." v. 18. To substitute the notion of misery after death, instead of the idea of literal perishing, would do away with the whole force of the apostle's argument throughout. For he proceeds all along upon the supposition, that it is the fact of a resurrection that alone makes it worth while to scorn present pleasures and to labour agreeably to the will of Christ. Every thing depends on a resurrection of the dead. Now there is such a resurrection for mankind, because Christ is risen: whose resurrection is a proof of the sufficiency of his atonement for the sins of the world. So the resurrection of man is proved by, and grows out of, so as to be dependent upon, Christ's resurrection. If then Christ had not interposed, no man would have risen. And this non-rising, remaining under the power of death, would be 'perishing.' And this perishing would have been so complete and final, as that, had it been the prospect before him, Paul would have said, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'"



*Reply to the foregoing.*

1. I agree with Mr. Dobney that every thing depends on the resurrection of Christ, in reference to man's resurrection.

2. That the resurrection of Christ is a proof of the sufficiency of his atonement for the sins of the world.

3. That were there no resurrection, then those who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.

But 4th, I do not agree with Mr. D. as to the meaning of the term 'perished.'

I understand the argument of Paul to be this,

First. If Christ is not risen, the faith of Christians in the teaching of all the Apostles was vain and false, and they were yet unsaved, or were yet in their sins. For the belief of a lie could not save or justify them. "Your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins."

Secondly. In that case, those who had died in that faith and hope, were lost; for they believed in vain and lived and died in sin: thus they are perished irrecoverably. There is no salvation for them.

The term 'perish,' as used in the Bible, does not imply a destruction of conscious being. There cannot be a solitary instance of the use of it in this sense, produced, as applied to man.

I grant that it is expressive of the idea of death, a separation of body and spirit, as in Luke xiii. 3, 5. "I tell you nay, but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Here it is applied to the death of the impenitent.

In Isa. lvii. 1, it expresses the death of the righteous. "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart." But the same text affirms of those who thus perish that he "shall enter into peace, they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness." The term is also expressive of the second death or the final doom of the wicked. John iii. 16. "That whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life." Here *perish* is put in contrast with everlasting life, and is equivalent to 'the second death' or part in the lake of fire. In this sense believers shall never perish. "I give unto them

eternal life and they shall never perish." It cannot be proved to mean more than the term and fact of death, either the first or second. I have proved that death does not destroy the conscious existence of the spirit; and hence the term 'perish,' does not prove it. If there is no resurrection, therefore, those who are fallen asleep in Christ are 'perished' in the sense of death, a separation of body and spirit, and are lost or 'perished,' in that their spirits are in the state into which the wicked enter at death. That place, Peter calls a "prison." 1 Pet. iii. 19. Isaiah calls it the same. Isa. xxiv. 22. They are dead and unsaved, for they believe in vain.

Paul cannot mean that they would perish, in the sense of the second death; for that is impossible unless they first have a resurrection.

This often quoted text from Paul is not, therefore, an exception to my position. For if Christ is not risen, his argument is, there is not only no resurrection but no salvation of any kind.

#### WE WILL NOW CONSIDER THE SECOND QUESTION.

II. *Does scripture teach that the wicked will in some form exist eternally in conscious torment?*

We come now to the most solemn and awful part of our subject: and should deeply feel that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

---

#### WHAT HAS, AND WHAT HAS NOT, BEEN PROVED.

I have proved that the soul and spirit do live after the man, as such, dies; and that the dead live like God in spirit, and in spirit will be judged. So far we have gone.

But I have not proved that because the dead live in spirit till the judgment, therefore, the wicked will live in that or some other form or state to eternity, in a state of conscious torment.

To this point I will now apply myself.

That the punishment of the wicked will be 'eternal,' both Mr. Dobney and myself are agreed. This therefore

is not the point in dispute. Will that punishment be torment? I affirm, and Mr. D. denies.

1. I begin by showing that the language in which the scriptures express the future punishment of the wicked, conveys the idea of torment as clearly as language can express it.

I first call attention to Matth. xiii. 40, 42. "So shall it be at the end of the world," or age. "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend," &c., "and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." This certainly conveys the idea of torment. So does Luke xiii. 28. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you, yourselves, thrust out." Here is the same thought kept in view.

Rom. ii. 6, 9. "Who will render to every man according to his works," &c. "To them who are contentious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus." *Tribulation* and *anguish* certainly express the idea of conscious torment. This class of texts could be far extended, but these three witnesses are sufficient for all purposes of deciding a point of doctrine, for they are unequivocal. God may say less, but never can say more than all the truth, either in promises or threatenings.

2. Again, the Scriptures represent the future punishment of the wicked as being in a lake of fire which is inconsumable.

Mark ix. 43, 44. "To go into hell fire, into the fire that never shall be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." This language certainly conveys the idea of a state of torment, protracted; I will not now consider how long.

Matth. xxv. 41. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." The idea of a location in fire, is expressive of acute torment,

and that fire to be everlasting, the idea of perpetuated torment.

3. We now come to the most important text bearing on this subject, which the Bible contains. Matth. xxv. 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Is this punishment to consist in conscious misery or torment? To this I reply, after carefully and deliberately weighing the arguments which have been offered against, not merely with a willingness but a desire to believe the reverse, if that is true, I am compelled to believe that the word of God most clearly decides the affirmative of this question to be correct.

First, the phraseology decides the question. *Eis kola-sin aionion*—"into eternal torment," is the strongest expression human language affords.

I am somewhat surprised that Mr. D. suffered his equanimity to be so much disturbed at the substitution of the word 'torment,' as he evidently was when he wrote his paragraph on page 214. He says, "Our Lord is represented as saying, these shall go away into everlasting misery, (or torment.) Whereas, he says nothing of the kind. Let us reverently adhere to his own expression; he says, 'everlasting *punishment*,' and not everlasting torment. And the two things are utterly distinct." \* \* "I have not the presumption to correct his phraseology, in order to harmonize it with my notions. But orthodoxy does this."

One not accustomed to reflect, on reading this passage, would be naturally led to the conclusion that our Lord spoke the English language, and used this identical English word, 'punishment,' instead of a Greek word, the primary meaning of which, according to all the best authorities on the subject, is, '*torment*,' the very word which the translators of our Bible render 'torment,' in 1 John iv. 18. "Because fear hath torment." To condemn an opponent for rendering it 'torment' in Matth., is to equally condemn the translators of John iv. 18. Nay, more; he must condemn every Greek lexicographer extant; and every critic of note who has ever written on the subject. I wish I could suppose Mr. D. ignorant of this fact. How



unjust, and ungenerous this insinuation;—"Let us not add to his words lest he reprove us." Did he not know that it is not adding "to his words," but simply a various rendering, perfectly justified by any Lexicon extant? Nor is the following more fair. "But what is punishment? Is misery, or torment, a fair and proper synonym?" Why did he ask that question, unless to hide the truth and divert attention from the fact that '*torment*,' is as proper a definition of *kolasin*, as punishment.

But it is not my purpose to discuss the subject. I will, however, do myself the pleasure of referring the reader to a critical discussion of the word, in the *Advent Herald*, by S. Bliss, in 1848.

This rendering is sustained by the general language of Scripture as quoted above, which represent the punishment as producing "weeping," "wailing," "gnashing of teeth," "tribulation," "anguish," "where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched," "furnace of fire," "everlasting fire," &c. Neither Mr. D., nor any other person of sense or reflection, can deny that these terms do express the idea of torment. Why, then, this terrible agitation at the bare suggestion of the word, where the original will warrant it? I regret this departure of Mr. D. from his usual fairness with an opponent, and can only account for it on a principle which he has intimated,—that, with a consciousness of truth, we can afford to be calm and generous to an opponent. But he is neither the one nor the other, on page 214. I strongly suspect he felt a peculiar tenderness when that spot was touched. Mr. D. says, p. 215:—

"Surely a complete and final and irretrievable destruction,—a destruction which is for ever, is to all intents an everlasting destruction. And so everlasting destruction would be everlasting punishment. And for the phrase everlasting destruction we have the highest authority in 2 Thess. i. 10. 'Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction.'

"In corroboration of which it may be observed, that the everlasting punishment affirmed by our Lord, Matt. xxv. 46, is the same thing as is threatened, v. 41, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.' But that fire is

everlasting, in relation to the object cast into it, which is not quenched till the object itself is consumed."

To this last remark I reply, the language of Scripture forbids the idea of either the fire itself, or the object cast into it being consumed. Mark ix. 45, 49, will furnish an illustration of the point. "Than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched." The original reads thus: *eis to pur to asbeston*, "into the fire asbestos." *Asbestos* is absolutely inconsumable by the action of fire. It is a substance of such a nature that what is enclosed in it will also be preserved from consumption in fire. The idea, therefore, is not simply that it is unquenchable, but absolutely *inconsumable*.

But not only is the fire inconsumable, but those cast into it are inconsumable, not by reason of any inherent immortality, but by reason of some conservative principle. Verse 49. "For every one shall be salted with fire, and (or, even as) every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." How forcible the illustration; as flesh is salted with salt to preserve it from putrefaction, every one shall be salted with fire; yes, fire asbestos. I can conceive of no stronger expressions than are here used, to convey the idea of the eternity of the fire, and the eternal preservation of the objects in it.

The word '*destruction*' now demands our attention. Does this word, when applied to men, signify the complete extinction of being? To this I reply, No. It is a synonym of death; it expresses a change in the state or mode of being.

I appeal to the scriptures for the import of the word as there used. And nothing, in my opinion, shows the weakness of the cause of the destructionists in a more unfavourable light, than the frequent references which some of them make to popular definitions, to establish their points. These definitions may be very good, and generally correct, but do not, as they either do, or ought to know, establish the scriptural use of those words.

#### DESTRUCTION MEANS ETERNAL TORMENT.

I shall now proceed to prove that the Scriptures do sometimes use the word to express that idea. Do not

start at this announcement; but read attentively my evidence and argument in support of the proposition.

I. The Apostle Paul informs us that Christ is to "destroy him that has the power of death, that is, the devil," or Diabolos. Heb. ii. 14. This is as plainly a foretold destruction as can be pointed out in Scripture. It is equally pointed with the destruction of wicked men, as foretold, 2 Thess. i. 10.

In what is the destruction of Diabolos, or the devil, to consist? Does the word of God define this point, and inform us specifically of his final doom? I reply it does; Rev. xx. gives us a detailed account of the intermediate and final doom of the devil. 1. His first or intermediate doom, is, that he shall be confined in the abyss or bottomless pit a thousand years. 2. He is to be loosed a little season and make his last assault on the Saints, and be "cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, *and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.*"

I ask, is it possible to use language more expressive of eternal torment than is here used? If so, what is that language? How can it be so put together as to make that idea more distinct and positive? Mr. Dobney admits that the torment of the devil will be eternal. In p. 229 he says,

"The writer simply affirms that the *devil* shall be tormented for ever and ever; which, whatever be the legitimate meaning, (concerning which we need not inquire,) no one disputes." This is granting the whole question. If the foretold destruction of the devil, is eternal torment, day and night, what evidence is there in existence that the destruction of wicked men will not be the same?

II. *The foretold doom of "the BEAST" is destruction.* This is declared, Rev. xvii. 8. "The beast which thou sawest, was and is not, and shall ascend out of the (abyss or) bottomless pit, and go into perdition." The word here rendered "perdition" is *apooleian*. Precisely the same word is used in the following text; Matth. vii. 13. "Enter ye in at the straight gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way which leadeth to *destruction*;" *apooleian*. If



both the beast and wicked men are doomed to perdition," and that "perdition" is "*destruction*," as it is rendered in Matthew, in what is that destruction to consist?

The fate of the beast is thus specifically described. Rev. xix. 20. "And the beast was taken and with him the false prophet, &c. "These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Such is their *perdition*, or *destruction*.

But it is urged, "the ejection of the beast and false prophet, into the lake of fire, is their end; they are consumed in that fire or burnt up." I reply no such fact is asserted in the Bible; but the reverse is declared. They are tormented day and night for ever and ever. You must grant, at the end of the thousand years, when the devil is cast into the lake of fire, that the beast and false prophet are still there. "Where the beast and false prophet are." But, it is replied, "NO, that does not appear in the text. The word "*are*" is not in the original but is inserted by the translators; and we have as good a right to insert "*were*" as "*are*." Yes, if the grammatical construction of the text will allow it, which it does not. It declares that the beast and false prophet shall be tormented there as long as the devil is. "And shall be tormented." The Greek verb thus rendered, is in the third person plural number, and can only be justly rendered by either expressing or implying the pronoun, "they," "and they shall be tormented." There is nothing more decisive than the person of the verb. Had it only meant the devil, the third person *singular* would have been used. The beast, the false prophet, and the devil, therefore, are each to be "tormented day and night for ever and ever." If the *destruction* or *perdition* of the beast is to consist in "eternal torment," by what authority do you make the destruction or perdition of wicked men to mean less? If the one is not an end of being, how do you prove the other to be so? It is solemn mockery and trifling to attempt it.

Have we not, therefore, good authority for concluding that the "everlasting destruction" of the wicked is "everlasting torment?" Have I not fairly sustained my position, that "Destruction sometimes means eternal torment?"



But Mr. D. tells us, p. 230:—

“Whatever this lake of fire may really symbolize, it is before the great day of judgment that *the devil* is represented as cast into it. It is, moreover, that into which the beast and false prophet were previously cast, long before the final close of human history, xix. 20. Now the beast and false prophet are not individual and historical persons really. They are symbolic persons. Many expositors tell us that they symbolize a system, which is to come to an utter end, rather than particular individuals. If so, the idea of torment is not to be literally understood, of course.”

This is certainly a most singular passage. I. He had just admitted the eternal torment of the *devil*, but would not discuss what it meant. But *only* the *devil* is threatened with torment there.

II. It is the same place into which the beast, &c., had long before been cast. He being only a symbolic person, the representative of a system to come to an utter end, is not the subject of torment literally, therefore the devil, a real being, who is a subject of torment, cannot be literally tormented, or to say the least may not be literally tormented.

I will throw this argument of Mr. D. into the syllogistic form.

The devil, and he alone, is threatened with eternal torment in the lake of fire.

But that lake of fire is that into which the beast, who is not threatened with torment, and who is not a real, but a symbolical person, the representation of a system which is to come to an utter end, and hence not the subject of literal torment, was long before cast.

Therefore the devil, who is confessedly a subject of, and threatened with torment, cannot, or may not, be literally tormented.

Truly! I do not wonder at Mr. D.'s expression of a willingness to “waive” this argument “altogether.” The wonder is, that he did not “waive” it before he introduced it. Is that Mr. D.'s argument? I submit that it is fairly stated as it stands on his pages.

But are his positions correct, that the beast is only a symbolical person, not a subject of torment? It will probably be replied, "Mr. D. did not say that such was the fact; but only referred to what was the opinion of many expositors; and if that opinion is correct, the idea of torment is not literal."

I reply to this, he must first prove that it is correct, before his reference to the fact is of the least force. But this he neither has done nor can do.

But the fact that they are recognised as still existing in the lake of fire, at the end of the thousand years, and it is then affirmed of them, that they, with the devil, are to be "tormented day and night, for ever and ever," is proof that they are something more than a system which is to come to an utter end. If the being cast into a lake of fire and brimstone was only the symbol of an "utter end," we should hear nothing of them and their torments for ever and ever, or a thousand years afterward.

But the perdition of ungodly men, or the destruction of ungodly men, for they are one and the same thing, one word being rendered by the two English words, is the same as that of the devil and his angels. "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." That is a lake of fire where *they* are to be tormented day and night for ever and ever. Is not *kolasin*, then, justly rendered "torment," "everlasting torment?" "I submit it is."

#### THE FINAL DOOM OF THE WICKED, AS DETERMINED BY THE LATEST ACCOUNT GIVEN OF THEM IN SCRIPTURE.

The 21st chapter of Revelation thus contrasts the final condition of the righteous and the wicked. Verses 7, 8.

"He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.

"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake

which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death."

This chapter, it is on all hands agreed, is a description of the everlasting state of men after the judgment. The righteous inherit all things previously described. The wicked have "part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Are they to exist there, or are they to cease to be? I reply, we have one more intimation on this subject. Chap. xxii. 14, 15.

"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

"For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."

Here the condition is contrasted by presenting one part as entering through the gates into the city;—the other as being without the city. There is no intimation of an utter end of being having come to them, nor yet as being at all in prospect. Here the word of God leaves them, in the lake of fire, in everlasting torment, "without" the holy city.

The second death, therefore, no more proves the extinction of being, than the first death. It has been proved that death does not extinguish either the soul or spirit. It cannot be proved that the second death will do as much, even to the body. And if this could be proved, the spirit still remains not subject to death in the sense of destruction of conscious being. The second death is defined by the word of God, "Shall have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone; this is the second death." "Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

But I shall be told, that Christ assured his disciples that God was "able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

I reply, I do not deny the power of the Creator to destroy, extinguish, or annihilate. But it should be remem-

bered that destruction is used in scripture as the synonym of everlasting torment in the lake of fire, at least in the well defined cases, the beast, the false prophet, and the devil. It cannot be proved to imply more in the text under consideration. The terms used to qualify the fire of Gehenna, indicate that such is its meaning:—"The fire asbestos." "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched; for every one shall be salted with fire, even as every sacrifice is salted with salt."

#### ETERNAL LIFE—ITS IMPORT.

Mr. Dobney contrasts the terms used to express the fate of the two classes, p. 168.

"Entering the school of Christ, what shall we find here? Much about 'Life,' 'Eternal life,' 'Immortality.'—But what? We will bring the various passages together, with those, also, which speak of those unhappy and inexcusable sinners who do not come to Christ for the blessings of salvation, and then see to what conclusion they conduct us.

'The righteous shall go in to *life eternal*.' 'He shall receive in the world to come *eternal life*.' 'He that believeth in him, shall have *everlasting life*,' &c.

'He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life.' [Why not add—but the wrath of God abideth on him?] 'The preaching of the cross is to *them that perish*, foolishness.' 'Vessels of wrath fitted *for destruction*.' (*Apooleia*, perdition.) 'Whose end is *destruction*.' (*Apooleia*, perdition.)

This contrast he continues, but these are a fair exhibition of the whole. He studiously avoids quoting these texts. 'Wailing and gnashing of teeth, 'Tribulation and anguish,' 'Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.' These are all omitted, as much as though they constituted no part of the threatened doom of the wicked. But, yet, these are qualifying terms, descriptive of the perdition or destruction they will endure.

I admit *Eternal Life* to mean just what it expresses on



its face,—resurrection from the dead in an immortal and incorruptible body, rendered such by the indwelling of the Spirit of God; and that the wicked have not either this life, nor incorruption, nor immortality. But it does not follow that they, for that reason, have no conscious being. They have neither of those attributes now, yet they have conscious existence. The devil has them not, yet he has conscious being. He will have it for ever and ever. The beast and false prophet have not, yet they will have being in torment for ever and ever; and that constitutes the scriptural exposition of destruction or perdition. “The wrath of God abideth on him;” is exegetical of “shall not see life.” Can the wrath of God abide on a nonentity? Let the candid reader decide.

I submit that Mr. D. has not given a fair contrast between the fate of saints and sinners;—but the contrast he has given makes nothing for his purpose until he shows that *apooleia*, *perdition*, *destruction*, does not signify *torment everlasting* in a lake of fire. Till he or some one else does this, the terrible fact stands confirmed by his numerous quotations of threatened perdition and destruction, that the destruction and perdition of the enemies of God, is everlasting torment in a lake of fire.

Again, Mr. D. says, p. 231:—“Because in the lake of fire the devil is to be tormented for ever, it does not necessarily follow that quite another race of intelligences, cast into the same lake, must therefore exist as long as he does, and endure the same torment.”

To this I reply:—My argument is this:—The devil is according to Paul to be destroyed. But when that destruction is specifically defined it is shown clearly that his destruction consists in everlasting torment. The same is true of the beast and the devil, and there can be no reason shown, why, when destruction is pronounced against wicked men, it will not be the same in kind and duration. Mr. D. entirely loses the benefit of the word destruction.

He continues:—“If they say that, because the devil, being cast into a lake of fire, is tormented for ever, therefore sinners cast into the same, are for that same reason tormented for ever,—we must hold them to the point, and

they in fairness must affirm something more. They must affirm, for instance, that all men, even the least guilty, will endure precisely the same torment as the devil himself."

To this I reply:—No such thing can in fairness be demanded of me. For although I might not be able to see and define how on the principle of eternal existence in the same place of torment, there can be degrees of punishment, yet it is a revealed fact that it will be so. For some in the day of judgment, the Judge has declared, it will be more tolerable than for others. And again "to render to every man according to his works." These, with other express texts, declare the fact of graduation of punishment. I submit to the authority as implicitly as when he says these shall go away into (*koasin aioonion*,) eternal torment. The Judge of all the earth will do right. And my business is to persuade men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God, not to lower down the standard of divine truth, nor abate one jot from the terrible denunciations of divine wrath, revealed in the Word of God. I protest against the position assigned by Mr. Dobney.

#### THE GREEK WORD, KOLASIN.

I cannot yet pass over the Greek word *kolasin*, rendered, Matthew xxv. 46, "punishment;" and in 1 John iv. 18, "torment." I have already shown the injustice of Mr. Dobney, in charging his opponents with the "presumption" of correcting our Lord's "phraseology," because they substitute the word "torment," in place of the word "punishment." I will here quote from page 65 of his work, to show that he was perfectly aware of the fact, that *kolasin* is sometimes rendered torment.

"And in the remaining two passages, the word *κολαζω*, once as a noun, and once as a participle; in both instances correctly rendered 'punishment' and 'punished.' Now the only instances in which this word, in any form, occurs in the New Testament are—

"Matt. xxv. 46. 'And these shall go away into everlasting *punishment*.'

"Acts iv. 21. 'So when they had further threatened

them they let them go, finding nothing how they might *punish* them.'

"2 Pet. ii. 2. 'The Lord knoweth how to . . . reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment, *to be punished.*'

"1 John iv. 18. 'Because fear *hath torment.*'

"A thorough exposition of this last passage (which alone occasions any difficulty as to the New Testament use of the word *κολασις*), would form too long a digression, but I think a close examination would show that the idea of punishment is really contained in it. Let the logical connexion between verse 17th and this be observed, and that the apostle has made distinct reference to the day of judgment, at which all who have possessed true Christian love (his chief theme is brotherly love,—compare iii. 19—23) will have boldness."

The object of Mr. D. in this passage, is to show the difference between the scriptural forms of expression made use of to denote chastisement and punishment, and thus convict the universalists of the truth of the doctrine of future punishment.

Of the four passages quoted, in each of which the Greek word *κολαζω*, in some form is used, he says, the last "alone occasions any real difficulty as to the New Testament use of the word *κολασις*."

But how does the last occasion any real difficulty in proving it to mean punishment? It does not, according to his own showing, constitute any real difficulty in proving the word to signify punishment. For in p. 215, he says, "I of course admit that the everlasting infliction of torment would be everlasting punishment."

The difficulty, therefore, did not lay in reconciling the word *kolasin*, "torment," with the idea of its meaning punishment, so much as in harmonizing the rendering of it "torment," in that place, and then ridding himself of its force when he should call up the term, and make use of it for another purpose than to disprove universalism.

It is evident from this passage, as well as others in part first, that his discussion of the question of universal salvation was intended to prepare the way for another work,

when engaged in which, he would find it more difficult to combat the existing prejudice against his positions. But if he could, while defending orthodoxy against universalism, secure the assent of his orthodox readers to those positions, he might with the greater safety to his cause bring them forward, when he should need their benefit.

But if he suffered the word *kolasin*, in 1 John iv. 18, to stand out in its naked character, "torment," it must be met again. But as it is, he leaves it by remarking, that "A thorough exposition of this last passage would form too long a digression, but I think a close examination would show that the idea of punishment is really contained in it."

#### ETERNAL LIFE:—SECOND DEATH.

These two words express the final state of the two classes of the human race, the righteous and the wicked. What is the import of the terms? I have already conceded that "eternal life" is expressive of the eternal existence of man as such, consisting of soul, body and spirit, in a union so perfect, that death will never again supervene to decompose or separate the parts. That the resurrection body, by virtue of a nature received from its union with the Spirit of God, is rendered immortal, not liable to death or dissolution. Eternal life is not affirmed of the spirit, for the reason that no human being will be allowed to exist in that state; for all who died in Adam are to be made alive in Christ; that is, restored from a state of death to a resurrection body. But the existence of the wicked in the resurrection, is not recognised as eternal life. On the contrary, it is said of them, they "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them." "Shall not see life," does not mean, surely, that they shall not be raised from the dead into a state of conscious existence. That would be a palpable contradiction of other passages. But it does mean that they will remain under the wrath of God, and so remaining, "have part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death."



## MEANING OF SECOND DEATH.

Does this term signify an extinction of conscious being? I reply, certainly not. But it does imply torment eternal. For surely no one will deny that to be cast into a lake of fire, is to be tormented: but this, and not extinction of being, constitutes the scriptural definition of "the second death."

But it is replied, death and hell are also said to be "cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death." And that their being cast into it is the symbol of their utter destruction! That they, having no rational existence, cannot be tormented.

To this I reply, even admitting that it does signify an utter end of irrational existence, it by no means follows that it will constitute the utter end of rational creatures. Nor does it. I have proved that the devil, the beast, and the false prophet, are each to be cast there, and to be tormented there for ever and ever. The scriptures declare all the wicked will have part there. And Rev. xiv. 9—11 declares that they shall be tormented there. But I will permit Mr. Dobney to present this subject.

"But let us pass on to the consideration of another text. And as I said there were three passages in particular, which, more than all others, are thought to teach the orthodox doctrine, we will come at once to the examination of them. One, however, has been already considered, namely, Matt. xxv. 46. The remaining two are found in the book of the Apocalypse. The first is—

"Rev. xiv. 9—11. 'And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation: and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.'

"This is indeed an awful passage, and, more decidedly

perhaps than any other, seems to favour the common notion of an eternity of misery. And I must confess that I have myself adduced it in former years in support of that doctrine, which I once held as firmly as any do at the present time. But a more careful examination of the text, in its connexion, led me to consider my earlier interpretation of it to be untenable. \* \* \* The advocates of any tenet—no matter what—must be hard driven, if they are glad to take their stand amid the hieroglyphs that attract us to the isle of Patmos.”

Once more, he says :—

“I submit that the terror-stricken announcement of this ‘third angel’ does not at all relate to the future condition of sinners after the judgment day. For,—

“II. Their torment is in verse 11, represented as synchronous with their worship. ‘They who *worship* the beast *have* no rest,’ &c. \* \* \*

On this passage from Mr. Dobney, I remark,

1. It is a poor compliment he pays his own theory, to object to the passage because it is found in the apocalypse. Any theory which demands so great a price as a sacrifice of the book of Revelation for its support, should be revised.

2. His denial that this passage relates at all to the future condition of sinners after the judgment day is imperfectly sustained. His scheme of interpretation does not meet the case. The scorching men with great heat, and the burning of great Babylon, does not meet the case. For the worshippers and votaries of the beast are the agents of the woman’s destruction, whereas the worshippers of the beast, &c., are, according to the text, to be themselves tormented.

3. His allegation that “their torment,” verse 11, “is represented as synchronous with their worship,” is not sound. The text declares, “if any man worship the beast,” &c., “the same **SHALL DRINK**,” not the *same drinketh*; and again, “*shall be tormented*,” not, *are tormented*. Mr. D. was certainly in too much haste when he penned that paragraph, to look carefully over the text, and weigh its import in an impartial balance.

“The same **SHALL DRINK** of the wine of the wrath of

God which is poured out without mixture, into the cup of his indignation; and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in presence of the Lamb."

This is certainly in the future tense, and not synchronous with the worship. The question remains,—with which is the "Ascendeth up," and "Have no rest," synchronous? the worship, or the torment? clearly with the torment. For the smoke of their torment cannot ascend up, until their torment commences. The whole scene of torment and restlessness is subsequent to, and consequent on, the worship. Any candid opponent will confess the soundness of this view. The truth is, the torment here threatened against the worshippers of the beast, is their final punishment; and not any intermediate punishment. For all intermediate wrath, however terrible, is not without mixture; but with this wrath there is no mixture; it is filled with unmitigated wo.

The parallel between this and the devil's doom is so analogous as to need no suggestion as to their identity. And as the wicked are to be cast into, and have part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; and as not one word is said in connexion with the last seven plagues as to fire and brimstone being an instrument of those plagues, the conclusion is just, that the text relates to future punishment in the lake of fire, Rev. xxi. 8, and not to the last seven plagues. Will Mr. D. deny that the worshippers of the beast will then be cast into that lake? Certainly not. Will he deny, or doubt, even, that that fire will torment them? He cannot do it. The terrible fact, then, is established, that the wicked shall be *tormented*, that the smoke of that torment ascendeth up for ever and ever. That the subjects of it have no rest day nor night. And surely if they ever come to an end of being, they will find rest from the torment. A nonentity cannot be tormented.

A reference to Isa. xxxiv., where the smoke of the land of Idumea is said to ascend up for ever and ever, is frequently made to evade the force of the text before us. But it avails them nothing till they first prove that passage has had a fulfilment, which they cannot do:—or till they prove

that it is not a prediction of the eternal desolation of that land, as is so many times repeated in the word of God. There is no promise of restitution for the land of Edom, even when the whole earth rejoiceth it will be desolate. Its smoke will go up for ever and ever.

I have now proved that the destruction of the devil is to consist in eternal torment. That the perdition or destruction of the beast is to consist in eternal torment. And that the wicked are to share the same doom; and hence, that eternal torment in fire and brimstone, and not extinction of being, *is the second death.*

J. LITCH.

*Philadelphia, Jan. 9, 1851.*

---

#### TO OPPONENTS.

A word to those who have favoured us with their strictures. We have carefully read what our opponents have been pleased to publish on the subject of the views advocated by the Pneumatologist, but have not as yet seen any thing demanding a reply; for all they have said, which under any circumstances we could *condescend* to notice, is fully met in the work itself. All we ask, is, for those who think our arguments refuted, to carefully read them, and then judge. But the facts are, those who thus think, are those who have never attentively read our work. And to reply, for their benefit, would be lost labour; others do not need it.

We have endeavoured to treat our subject, and all connected with it, with Christian courtesy and candour, and had hoped for a reciprocity from all Christian people. Whether we have received it, we leave others, together with the Judge of all the earth to decide.

---

NOTICE.—We were so far advanced in January, before we could get our present number from the press, that we concluded to publish four, instead of three monthly numbers. Two more will close the volume.



THE  
PNEUMATOLOGIST,

J. LITCH, EDITOR.

---

Vol. I.]

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1851.

[Nos. 11 & 12.

---

DIALOGUE ON THE NATURE OF MAN, HIS STATE IN  
DEATH, AND THE FINAL DOOM OF THE WICKED.

WE adopt the names of Pneumatologist and Materialist, as the disputants, as being more expressive of the sentiments which the two parties represent than any other which occurs to our mind. By the word *Pneumatologist*, is meant an advocate of the doctrine that man possesses a spiritual nature susceptible of conscious existence separate from the body, and hence, that it can and will exist in consciousness between death and the resurrection. By *Materialist*, is meant one who believes the consciousness of man to be entirely dependent on his physical organization, and that his spirit is wind, or the breath of life, and hence that he must of necessity be unconscious between death and the resurrection.

*Pneumatologist.* As you appear, friend Materialist, to be very fond of discussing your favourite views respecting the state of the dead and final doom of the wicked, if it will suit your convenience, I shall be much gratified to have a conversation with you on those important subjects.

*Materialist.* Certainly, it will afford me sincere pleasure to hold a candid and friendly conversation with you on those subjects; particularly, as I always feel strengthened in my faith after such discussion, by finding the relative strength of the respective views. For nothing appears more rational than for us "firmly to believe the word of inspiration, which declares that the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* (the identical sub-

stance that was formed out of the substance of the ground,) *became* a living soul." Gen. ii. 7.

*Pneu.* Then, if I rightly understand your position, you believe the man entire to be *soul*, and that all which pertains to his nature was made of the substance of the dust of the earth. with nothing superadded except breath?

*Mate.* Indeed, "I admit the scriptural exposition, that the whole *compound* nature of man was formed of the ground, with nothing superadded to the perfect organization but breath to cause it to live."

*Pneu.* Will you have the kindness to tell me what the Lord means, when affirming his creative power, Zech. xii. 1, He declares himself the Being, not only who "stretcheth forth the heavens and layeth the foundations of the earth," but also "who formeth the spirit of man within him?"

*Mate.* "This is undoubtedly the strongest text you have in support of the independent and separate creation of the spirit of man."

*Pneu.* That is an after consideration. I asked you for an explanation of the text, that shall harmonize with your declared faith, that the whole compound nature of man was made of dust of the ground. *Man*, I admit, was made of dust; but our text declares that God formeth the spirit of man within him. Now it is manifest that he could not form something within man before he existed. Man was formed, but was dead. "The body without the spirit is dead." Therefore, the man, while dead, could not have had a spirit; it was formed subsequently to the formation of the body.

*Mate.* "The text proves just what it says, no more, no less. It simply proves that God formed man's spirit, and so he did the spirits of the beasts."

*Pneu.* I am aware that it proves just what it says, and that is, that the spirit of man was formed within him; and hence must have been a subsequent work or act to the formation of man out of the dust of the ground; but no such affirmation is made concerning beasts; at least I have never found it in Scripture. But perhaps you can give me light, by referring me to the text in proof of it?

*Mate.* The word *Pneuma*, spirit, means wind, breath,

&c., and therefore the passage in question means the wind or breath of life which God breathed into him.

*Pneu.* Your explanation does not meet the case. For there is a higher and more important meaning to the word *Pneuma*. It is descriptive of the highest intelligence in the universe. God is a spirit, *Pneuma*. Here we can rise no higher; and we prove every conceivable or possible perfection to attach itself to spirit. So, also, "He maketh his angels spirits;" they also are possessed of power and intelligence. So also is a spiritual nature ascribed to demons; and both intelligence and power belong to them. We now come to man, and ask, Do the Scriptures ascribe the same qualities to his spirit? They do. "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? So also the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God." 1 Cor. ii. 11. If God communes with us, it is through the medium of our spirit. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." Thus you will see that man has a spirit allied to the nature or substance of Deity, and partaking, in its finite measure, of his intelligence. I have now proved two points, which you will please bear in mind, and meet, or acknowledge your inability to do so:—1. That God formed the spirit of man within the man, which must have been after the man was made of dust, and hence something was "*superadded*" to him to constitute the compound being, consisting of "soul, body and spirit." 2. That man's spirit, like the Spirit of God, is intelligent.

*Mate.* But "the primary, and therefore highest meaning of the word spirit, is breath or wind."

*Pneu.* How does this appear? Did breath or wind precede the existence of God? If he, a Spirit, pre-existed before wind, then that is not the primary import of spirit. And most certainly the term is used in a higher sense when applied to God, than when used to express the idea of wind.

*Mate.* I grant that I am wrong there; and that the use of the word spirit, as applied to God, is a higher sense than mere wind. But still, I must believe the Scripture testimony, that "God made *man*," not a part of him, "of

the dust of the ground," and that when he breathed into him the breath of life, "man became a living soul."

*Pneu.* You are right in believing the Scripture testimony that God made man of the dust of the ground. But are you right in denying, doubting, evading, or sliding over the other testimonies, that God "formed the spirit of man within him;" that the things of man only the spirit of man knows, &c.? Would you thus undervalue or evade the force of these texts, if they did not bear hard against your favourite sentiment? Do you treat the passages fairly, and give them their full force?

*Mate.* Will you not grant that the word *Pneuma* is frequently used in the Scriptures to signify wind and breath?

*Pneu.* I certainly admit it. But what do you gain by the concession? Suppose, if you will, that in nine cases out of ten (which is not true,) the word is expressive of wind or breath. If it is once clearly used as expressive of an intelligent spirit in man, the point is gained. For the truth of God does not depend on the multiplicity of repetitions. If he once testifies clearly that there is an intelligent spirit in man, we are bound to admit it as fully as though he had repeated it a hundred or a thousand times. Have I not, by a most plain and unequivocal text, proved the spirit of man in him to be the intelligent principle? I wish a candid answer.

*Mate.* Yes, I must admit that you have; but that does not prove the spirit to be conscious after it leaves the body.

*Pneu.* I have not assumed that it does. The point at issue is not, at present, whether it is so or not. But was the whole compound being, man, made of the dust of the ground? Or was his body made of dust, and his spirit formed within him afterward? So that when the "dust returns to the earth as it was, the spirit," not being of dust, "shall return to God who gave it?" Let us calmly keep to the point. Can you, in view of this text, deny that the spirit, which I have already proved to have been formed within the man, and to be intelligent, was formed of something beside dust? For had it been formed of dust, it would return to dust. But it is not so. Dust to dust; the spirit to God. Is it not so?

*Mate.* Well, yes; I do not see but I shall be compelled



in honesty to admit the position you have taken. For had the spirit been formed of dust, it must at death return to dust. And if it were only wind or breath, intelligence would not be ascribed to it.

But even admitting this point, which I am constrained to do, it does not and cannot disprove the declaration of Solomon, "The dead know not any thing."

*Pneu.* Do you admit of no explanation or qualification of that text?

*Mate.* What explanation does it need, or what qualification? Can it be more plain than it now is? "The dead know not any thing."

*Pneu.* If you receive this oft quoted clause of the passage without qualification, have you well considered what else you must admit? For the next clause, and the context in general, declares, "Neither have they any more a reward." And again, "Neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing which is done under the sun." Receive this without qualification, and we renounce the doctrine of a judgment and resurrection of the dead, and thus derange the whole gospel system. This is a point I have never yet known a materialist to attempt to meet or clear up. Yet, before the text on which you rely can be availing, you are bound to do it.

*Mate.* I confess it presents a difficulty which I do not know how to meet. But it must present as great a difficulty to your view of a resurrection and future judgment as to mine.

*Pneu.* Not at all. For I admit the text to be qualified and explained by the context and general scope of the passage; but such a proceeding would be fatal to your theory. It must stand unqualified, or fails to accomplish your purpose as a proof text. It is, therefore, a text which affords no support to your theory; you are entirely deprived of its help. And yet it is the great bulwark of your system, and has done more execution than any other text in the Bible.

The passage admits of an explanation in perfect harmony with the rest of the Scriptures. And no interpretation is of value unless it does harmonize with the whole testimony of God's word.

*Mate.* I acknowledge the principle, and shall be happy to hear your harmony of the text with the general testimony of the Bible.

*Pneu.* Certainly, I shall take pleasure in reviewing the passage. We will go back to Eccl. viii. 14, and consider the passage to chap. ix. 10. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." The writer, it would seem, fell into a reverie something like that of David in the 73d Psalm. One circumstance after another arose in his mind, and he contemplated them as a man of the world. He saw that the same things happened to the righteous as to the wicked; and sometimes, even, that it happened to the just according to the work of the wicked, and again to the wicked according to the work of the just. Then, in view of this fact, he concluded a religious life to be vain, and that it was well to make the best of the present life by eating, drinking, and indulging in mirth; that this is all he will have under the sun, and that the future is not to be taken into the account. For all things come alike to all, whether righteous or wicked, good or bad, clean or unclean, saint or sinner, holy or profane. There is one event to all, "their heart is full of evil" here, "madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead." As to the future, the living know they shall die; but the dead do not know any thing: "they have no more a reward," they are forgotten, no one cares for either their "envy, love, or hatred," and they have not "any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." He concludes, therefore, that the only good is to eat and drink with a merry heart, and seek all sensual enjoyments which can be found on earth, and to do any and every thing which comes to hand—for all ends with this life, nothing remains for another state. Permit me to ask if this is not a fair and candid synopsis of the sentiment of the passage?

*Mate.* Yes, I must acknowledge this is a fair view of the entire passage. And the writer evidently either personifies a skeptic, or was for a time left under infidel temptations; for he does not, throughout the passage, present one

ray of hope for the righteous any more than the wicked, in a future state. He neither intimates nor admits the idea of a future judgment which should rectify the seeming injustice of Providence.

*Pneu.* This, then, is my explanation of the passage. That the writer occupied the position of a wordling or infidel, and gave utterance to sentiments which crowded upon him while contemplating the state of things without reference to the word of God. But, in conclusion, he calls on men, from youth onwards, to remember God; chap. xii. 1. He declares the different destination of the body and spirit at death, the one returning to dust, the other to God. And finally, that our "whole duty is, to fear God and keep his commandments, for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing whether good or evil."

*Mate.* I must yield this text, and confess that a fair analysis of the entire passage does not sustain the sentiment of the unconsciousness of the dead as being of divine authority. And I also am free to say that I have not before taken a connected view of the passage. I shall never quote that text again as a proof text, that the dead are unconscious. But you must acknowledge that Psalm cxlvi. 3, 4, establishes the doctrine. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."

*Pneu.* Why do men put their trust in princes, or why are they tempted to do it? Is it not because those princes form purposes and make promises to help them? Why, then, not trust in them? Because they die like other men, and all their purposes, however sincerely they may have been made, are at an end. What, permit me to ask, has the text to do with either the consciousness or unconsciousness of the spirit which returns to God, when the dust returns to his earth? Does it not relate entirely to the things of this life, where princes do sometimes help men?

*Mate.* This seems to be a reasonable view; but if the thoughts perish, does it not prove the unconsciousness of the man?

*Pneu.* The word thoughts evidently means *purposes*, does it not?

*Mate.* Yes, this appears to be its import in this text.

*Pneu.* Did you never form a purpose which perished, that is, failed to be executed?

*Mate.* I have formed many such.

*Pneu.* Did you cease to be a conscious being because those purposes perished? Have you not since been capable of forming other purposes?

*Mate.* But that is a different case; for, in that case, the man is still alive—in this, he is dead: and, therefore, incapable of farther thoughts or purposes.

*Pneu.* Not quite so fast, my friend; you are begging the question. This is the very point in dispute. You allege, that because it is said that when princes and others die, the purposes they have formed of assisting those who trusted in them perish, therefore they must be unconscious after death. I deny your inference from the text; and by a simple illustrative example, show or prove to you that a man's purposes, thoughts, or resolutions may fail to be accomplished, or perish, and yet he remain a conscious being. So the man may die, his purposes fail of accomplishment, and yet his spirit, which returns to God, be in a state of conscious activity. This point, the text under consideration does not determine either one way or the other. I have observed a disposition on the part of materialists to confound the idea of the *thoughts* with the *thinking agent*, the *spirit*, which is entirely erroneous. There is the same distinction between a man and his thoughts after as before death. *Thought* is the *product*, man the *producer*. Is this not correct?

*Mate.* I admit the distinction, so far as the living man is concerned. A living man and his thoughts are distinct objects. But are not the mind and spirit one and the same thing?

*Pneu.* By no means. Mind is the result of spiritual action. I admit that by a figure of speech, by which the production is used for the producer, the word mind is sometimes used for spirit, but strictly and literally speaking they are not identical. No one confounds the "mind of the Lord," with the Lord himself, in this text, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Rom. xi. 34.



*Mate.* I see you are right; *mind* and *Lord* are distinct objects: mind being a production of the Lord. And I also perceive our error, in reference to the text in question, has originated in the confounding of the *mind* or *thoughts* with the agent who produces them, the spirit. But why should we not understand the term *death*, when we meet with it in scripture, the same as we do when it occurs in a newspaper: that is, that the man is extinct?

*Pneu.* Undoubtedly we should understand it the same in both cases. The difficulty lies in your assumption that when it occurs in a newspaper, we understand the term *death* to mean extinction of being. This is not true. I venture to say that nine out of ten throughout Christendom understand the word, when they find it in a newspaper, just in its scriptural sense, as being a cessation of the functions of animal life, the return of the body to dust, and the return of the spirit to God. It is surprising that any great and wise man like Mr. Locke should have made such a blunder, and still more so, that so many should follow him without reflection.

*Mate.* I know a popular theology has succeeded in leading the public mind into that error.

*Pneu.* But let me ask on what that popular theology is based? Is it not on the plain and obvious teaching of the Bible? "Then shall the dust return to the dust as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." Again. In what age did the "error" creep into the Christian church? Who was the heretic who first introduced it? Is there one of the early Christian fathers who taught any other doctrine than the consciousness of the spirit after death? Not so much as one testimony has ever been adduced from them in support of your theory, except a false and garbled one, plainly contradicted by the general testimony of the writer. The argument from antiquity is all our own.

*Mate.* True, you have the uniform testimony of the fathers on your side; but it is not the fathers, but the sacred scriptures, which is the standard of our faith. We have the same Bible to read which they had, and are as competent as they to learn the truth.

*Pneu.* I agree with you perfectly, that the Bible is the standard of appeal, and am perfectly content to abide by

its decisions on all matters of faith or duty. But it is strange that those who were acquainted with those who wrote the Bible, and heard them preach, and professed to be their disciples, should none of them have held your view if the apostles all held it. If our view is erroneous, the error must at some time have crept into the church, and it could not have crept in and become universal without controversy.

*Mate.* We will let that point pass, and confine our discussion to the scriptures. And you well know that they uniformly represent death as a sleep, which, when sound, is a state of total unconsciousness.

*Pneu.* I confess the correctness of the first proposition, "death is represented as a state of sleep," but not the second, "sleep is a state of total unconsciousness." It is not true. For, "in a dream, in visions of the night, when *deep sleep* falleth upon man, then openeth He their ear, and sealeth their instruction." Again, Job iv. 13—15: "In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up." Job xv. 33: Job was in a deep sleep, but yet in a state of consciousness. Daniel was in the same state: "Yet heard I the voice of his words; and when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground." Daniel x. 9. Universal experience proves that sleep is not a state of unconsciousness—for all, or nearly all, persons are subject to dreams in their sleep. Nothing, therefore, can be more foreign from the point than to produce the phenomenon of sleep to prove the unconsciousness of man in death—it proves the reverse.

*Mate.* But men do not dream when in sound sleep.

*Pneu.* Both Job and Daniel declare the reverse. They dreamed when in *deep sleep*.

*Mate.* It was only a vision which both Job and Daniel had while in a *deep sleep*, and therefore it proves nothing as to the consciousness of man in the sleep of death.

*Pneu.* I grant it was a vision which they each had, but were not lessons of wisdom imparted to them while in that state? And were they not conscious of what they saw in

those visions while in a deep sleep, after they awoke? This circumstance it is, which proves that sleep, even *deep sleep*, is not a state of total unconsciousness. For if it were so, even a supernatural communication would be forgotten as soon as the scene passed.

*Mate.* There is still a difference between a state of death and sleep; for the mind, in sleep, remains connected with bodily organs: but in death, all those organs cease to perform their functions.

*Pneu.* I understand you then to abandon your argument drawn from the fact that death is called sleep. You admit that a state of sleep is not necessarily a state of unconsciousness? Let us understand each other at each step: is this your meaning?

*Mate.* Yes, I am forced to abandon it, for it proves too much for my purpose; for if I maintain that sleep is the type of death, and if in sleep, even *deep sleep*, men are conscious in dreams and visions, and remember when awake what they saw and heard, I must admit that in death, the antitype, they may also be conscious.

*Pneu.* If you abandon this argument, I shall assume it. For it is undeniable that death is called sleep, both in the Old and New Testaments. So that the bearing of this fact on your theory, which you discovered, and which forced you either to abandon it or your theory, lies against the theory with all its force. It would have been more wise in you to abandon so difficult a system, than to undertake to rid yourself of the glaring fact that sleep is the type of death, and yet is not a state of total unconsciousness. Sleep does not typify a state of unconsciousness, but a state in which the mind is active when the bodily senses are closed. The mind, therefore, must be the result of spiritual perception and action. I admire your candour in yielding untenable points and arguments, but it would be much more consistent for you to give up your whole theory, which you find it so difficult to maintain.

*Mate.* That I cannot do; there are too many unanswerable arguments in its support, to admit of such a thing. The single fact that when a man receives a blow on the head, and is stunned, he is in a state of unconsciousness, proves the materiality of the human soul, and that mind is the result of material organization. For did he possess

a soul or spirit capable of consciousness, independent of bodily organs, the mind would still be active. So likewise do the facts of phrenology establish the same doctrine. For the power and vigour of the mind is in proportion to the size and activity of the brain, and each particular propensity is governed by the size of the organ on the brain.

*Pneu.* Your phenomena I admit, but not your inference deduced from them. It is true, a blow upon the head, deranging the brain, produces stupefaction. And also, it is true, that the strength and activity of the mind is in accordance with the size and activity of the brain, &c. But these facts no more prove that the soul or spirit of man is material in the sense in which the body is, or in other words, that the whole compound being man, was made of the dust of the ground, than the fact that a skilful violinist cannot produce music from his instrument when all the strings are either broken or relaxed, proves that his skill is lost. His skill is not impaired by the misfortune of his instrument. Give him another instrument, and he will discourse sweet music; or, if gifted with a musical voice, he will, after being disconnected from his instrument, prove to you that his musical powers have not failed him. The brain is the instrument on and through which the spirit acts in the living man; derange either the whole brain, or any of its parts, and just in that proportion the spirit fails to produce perfect mental action: but this by no means proves the spirit to be material, and dependent on its connexion with the body for its action. You may, with the same propriety, conclude the musician is dead and unconscious, because he cannot produce music from a broken and deranged instrument, as that the spirit is dead or unconscious because it does not produce thought from a mutilated or deranged brain.

*Mate.* I acknowledge your illustration to be a simple and forcible one; but it by means proves the truth of the point it illustrates, *i. e.* that the spirit is immaterial, and capable of action and thought independent of the body. True, it shows clearly that my conclusions do not necessarily follow my premises. But you will find it more difficult to establish your own theory, which must be done before mine is fully disproved.

*Pneu.* I do not think it so difficult. The phenomenon



of trance, as recorded in scripture, proves it. The word "*trance*" is from the Latin *transeo, to go*; and is applied to an ecstasy or catalepsy, because the spirit in those states is transported from one place to another. John was in a trance, therefore, when he informs us, Rev. iv. 2, that "Immediately I was in the spirit, (or as according to the original, *in spirit*, not *the spirit*,) and behold a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne," &c. This was a call to John, from heaven, to come up there; and immediately he was in the spirit and went there. He was in that trance or ecstasy, not in body, but in spirit. The same facts occurred, Rev. xvii. 3, and xxi. 9, 10: "So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns." "And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the bride the Lamb's wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem; descending out of heaven from God." In each of these texts the definite article is wanting in the original, and there is no call for supplying it. He was taken away in spirit to the places designated, and there revelations were made to him. I repeat, therefore, that the phenomenon of trance is proof of the separate and conscious existence of the spirit out of the body.

*Mate.* This, I admit, is a strong argument in favour of your doctrine. But yet it should be borne in mind that life was not extinct, there was still a connexion of the spirit with the body; and there probably was an action of the brain producing the mental phenomena which transpired. But in the case of suspended animation from drowning, the case is different: how many there are who have been in that state, who tell us they were perfectly unconscious! If the spirit is capable of separate action, then is the time for its exercise. But the fact that no such mental exercise takes place, is conclusive evidence that the spirit cannot act independently of the body.

*Pneu.* If you will carry your inquiries a little farther, you will be compelled to abandon that argument. Dr.

Nelson has used an illustration something like this :—Suppose two travellers wish to pass from one mountain to another, and a deep dark valley lies between ; that valley must be crossed before the light and prospects of the distant mountain are realized. The two enter the valley together, and are soon enveloped in thick darkness. At length one of them turns back, and brings his report that there is no light beyond a certain point on the road, that the farther he went beyond that point the more dark it became. The other continues on, crosses the valley, and as he begins to ascend the mountain, light breaks upon his vision, and increases as he progresses. At length he returns and makes his report. As far as both went, they agree that all was gross darkness. But the first is not a competent witness as to whether the distant mountain is light or dark. The second, who went on to the mountain, is a competent witness.

Now this illustration presents the truth with respect to suspended animation from drowning. All who have experienced it agree that at a certain stage consciousness is extinct ; but some who go beyond that, although still in the water, and the functions of the body more impeded than at first, consciousness returns. An acquaintance of mine, in Massachusetts, once fell overboard at sea, and was, when recovered, to appearance dead. His statement was, that after the sensation of strangling by the water running down his throat, he became at first unconscious ; but soon he came to himself, and saw both heaven and hell—the joys of heaven, and the torments of the world of wo. The effect of what he saw was such as to lead him to seek an interest in Christ. Now, no matter how many have passed half way through the dark valley, and returned, they are not competent witnesses of what is beyond ; their testimony cannot invalidate that of another who has been farther than themselves, and awoke to consciousness while yet in his drowning condition. There have been many of this class who bear witness to the same facts. There are multitudes who have, to all human appearance, died from sickness, and have been restored. They testify that, at first, they fell into a state of unconsciousness ; subsequently, they become sensible, look on their body and all

attending circumstances; examine their own identity, as the spirit of the person, meet with other spiritual beings, visit distant places, behold events and facts which they distinctly recollect, return to the body, become momentarily unconscious, and then awake to consciousness again in the body. Many facts of the above character have occurred, and living witnesses of their truth exist in most communities. If any one doubts, let him by free and frequent conversation on this subject draw out those with whom he meets, and it will not be long before he will find abundance of facts. The reason why those with whom these facts occur do not more frequently relate them, is, that public opinion has branded them as marks of superstition, and hence they are kept comparatively concealed.

The case of the little girl who died in Bangor, Me. in 1849, which was extensively published in the papers, is only one of multitudes which are of yearly occurrence.

*Mate.* That must, however, be a desperate cause which has to appeal for its support from the Bible to dreams, visions, trances, suspended animation, &c. Is not the Bible a sufficient rule of faith?

*Pneu.* To be sure it is. But who made the appeal to the subject of suspended animation? Did not my respected friend Materialist introduce it to sustain his own theory of the unconsciousness of the dead? Why, then, should he shrink from the result of the appeal, and charge me with abandoning the Bible as a rule of faith, and appealing to these facts? Is it not both unjust and ungenerous?

The Bible and facts will always harmonize; and if we imagine any well authenticated fact to be a contradiction of the Bible, we had better reconsider our theory of the teachings of the Bible on the point.

But your remarks show clearly that you abandon your argument drawn from unconsciousness during suspended animation, as worthless to your cause.

*Mate.* Yes, I confess that argument is yours; for I have myself heard of several cases such as you refer to, where persons apparently dead, on their recovery declared that after becoming free from the body they became entirely conscious.

*Pneu.* Why, then, did you introduce the subject to prove the reverse?

*Mate.* Because I have not been accustomed to reflect on those facts, and had forgotten them, while looking at a few instances of which I had heard, where the parties were unconscious.

*Pneu.* This, I have reason to fear, is too true of the great majority of Materialists. They do not look at both sides of the question, except it be for the purpose of refuting their opponents, and explaining away the facts and scriptures which they adduce in support of their views.

*Mate.* But you must acknowledge that Paul teaches the unconsciousness of the dead, 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18: "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." For had he believed the spirit to be alive, how could he have said, that if a certain fact was true, "then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*?"

*Pneu.* That depends on the meaning we attach to the term "*perished*."

*Mate.* Walker defines it thus:—"To perish; to die, to be destroyed, to be lost, to come to nothing." So, if Christ is not risen, then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are come to nothing. Thus he makes the future existence, even of the righteous, to depend on the resurrection of the dead.

*Pneu.* But why do you pass over his other definitions to select this? Why not attach to it one of these meanings: "to be lost;" or, "to be in a state of perpetual decay; to be lost eternally?" Is there any thing in the text or context which requires you to attach the particular meaning to the term which you have selected? But the question is not to be settled by an appeal to a dictionary, no matter how correct the definition may be, after all. We must appeal to the use of the term in the Bible, as determined by the connexion in which it is used. But the word rendered *perished*, or *perish*, 1 Cor. xv. 18, is used variously, and but once in any place where it can have the sense of bringing to nothing, attached to it; and even there not necessarily. 1 Cor. i. 19. "I will *destroy* the wisdom of the wise." The word in 2 Pet. iii. 6, "Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, *perished*," only signifies a convulsion and derangement of the structure and condition of the earth, but not a bring-



ing to nothing. The substance of the earth remained, and was restored to order. But if you say *καταστροφῆς* means the inhabitants of the world, then all you can make of the word *perished* is, that they were killed; but Peter has informed us of the destiny of their spirits, 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20; "By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." So that they only *perished* in the sense of being killed, while their spirits survive in prison.

But it is used, Matt. x. 6, in the sense of *lost*. "Go rather to the *lost* sheep of the house of Israel." The house of Israel were not brought to nothing, but they were estranged from God, and exposed to punishment. It is used in the sense of being killed, Luke xiii. 33. "I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." The death of Christ, therefore, was embraced and expressed by the term, and yet he was not so brought to nothing, as that he had not power to take up his own life, as he said, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." The most, therefore, which you can prove from the language of Paul, is, that if Christ is not raised, even those who died in the faith of Christ hoping for pardon and salvation through him, are *lost*; they believed a lie, and have no pardon, and no resurrection, for which they hoped. But there is no shadow of an intimation that they are brought to nothing.

*Mate.* You acknowledge that in 1 Cor. i. 6, the word may be construed in that sense. If that is a scriptural sense of the term, why may it not be the meaning here?

*Pneu.* For this reason, Luke, xiii. 33, teaches that the prophets who suffered martyrdom perished; yet Paul teaches us that the "spirits of just men made perfect" are in the heavenly Jerusalem, where God, Christ, the blood of sprinkling, and the angels are. Peter teaches us that the spirits of the antediluvians are in prison. Their spirits, therefore, are not brought to nothing.

*Mate.* Just men are not made perfect till the resurrection; the text, therefore, Heb. xii. 23, refers to a state after the resurrection.

*Pneu.* Not so; for after the resurrection the blood of sprinkling is of no farther service in the holy place, and when our High Priest comes forth, and sends away the sins of the people, he proclaims, "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." Heb. x. 17, 18.

Again, it is in the present tense, we "are come" to Mount Zion, the city of the living God, &c. "Ye are come." "Ye are not come to the mount which might be touched," &c., but "ye are come to mount Zion." That is, Israel came to mount Sinai, and stood at its base while Moses went into the mount to mediate the old covenant; from which mount he returned to establish and promulgate the covenant or law. That mount might be touched. But our Mediator has gone to a mount which we cannot touch, and we wait at its base while he is absent to mediate the new covenant, from whence he will return to promulgate it. So that now, God, Christ, angels, the blood of sprinkling, and spirits of just men, are there. Besides, they will not be the spirits of the just in the resurrection, but the just themselves made perfect. There is a perfection which Christians attain in this life; it is such as Job attained, and such as Paul speaks of, when he says, "Let as many as be *perfect* be thus minded." But it is not the perfection of the resurrection.

*Mate.* I perceive you have the advantage of me on the word "spirits," for it would be absurd to speak of the spirits of just men being in the heavenly Jerusalem, after the resurrection, when the whole person is there. But do you believe that the Spirit of Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison while he was dead?

*Pneu.* By no means. But that the Spirit of Christ in Noah went and preached, while the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, to those whose spirits are now in prison; as God said, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man."

*Mate.* This is certainly a difficult passage, and I confess I do not understand it.

*Pneu.* Will you not also confess that it is a strong argument, taken in its most obvious sense, in favour of my

views, that the spirit has a separate existence after death?

*Mate.* Yes, it must be admitted that, if taken in its obvious sense, it goes far to support your views. But I think it must have some other meaning. But although the text recognises the existence of the spirits in prison, it does not say they are in a state of consciousness.

*Pneu.* Do you really intend this as a serious argument or objection against their consciousness? The absurdity of the idea of the imprisonment of a nonentity or inanimate object, carries its own refutation on its face.

But can you point me to one solitary intimation of the death of the spirit of man? Is the spirit ever spoken of as being dead or dying?

*Mate.* I do not recollect any text where such a sentiment is found.

*Pneu.* Is it not important to the cause of the Materialists to prove that it does die?

*Mate.* It would certainly go far to support our cause.

*Pneu.* If I can prove that the dead live in spirit, will it not be conclusive evidence of the truth of my position?

*Mate.* Certainly. If the scriptures teach that, it ends the controversy.

*Pneu.* Let us then examine 1 Pet. iv. 5, 6: "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." "For this cause, also," (because they shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead,) "was the gospel preached to them that are dead." What is the cause? "That they should be judged (*κατα*) according to (or like) men in flesh, but live (*κατα*) according to (or like) God in spirit."

*Mate.* This is confessedly a very obscure text: nearly all commentators are agreed in this, but not in its meaning. And to base a system of faith on so obscure a passage is unwise.

*Pneu.* But the text is a part of God's revelation to us, is it not?

*Mate.* Yes, to be sure, it is a part of the acknowledged canon of scripture.

*Pneu.* Very well. If so, it is designed for our instruc-

tion. If the doctrine taught in Rev. xx. 12, is true, "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which are written in the books, according to their works;" is not the text a plain one?

*Mate.* I grant, if the dead, before they are raised, are to stand before God and be judged, it clears the passage of obscurity.

*Pneu.* Is not that the doctrine of that text?

*Mate.* Yes, if we understand it as literal. And I do not know any other way to understand it.

*Pneu.* Then does not the text in Peter prove that the dead live in spirit like God?

*Mate.* I must confess it does; at least, it is the most clear and consistent view I have ever seen or heard of the text. But, after all, you have not cleared up the obstacles thrown in your way by the Saviour, in the 16th of Luke, in the *parable* of the rich man and Lazarus, by which he teaches that the dead do not know any thing till they awake in the resurrection. All the time which elapses from the moment of death till then being to them a perfect blank.

*Pneu.* How do you make that appear? Does not the Saviour say that Lazarus died and was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom? Does he not also say, that the rich man died and was buried, and in hades he lifted up his eyes being in torment, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom?

*Mate.* Yes; but, then, they each are represented as having bodily members, eyes, tongue, fingers, &c., which cannot be till the resurrection. The period from death to the resurrection being one of unconsciousness, nothing is said of it; and when they awake to consciousness, it is to them as though they had just died.

*Pneu.* Can you point me to one solitary text in the Bible where sheol, or hades, is expressive of the place of final punishment after the resurrection?

*Mate.* No, I do not recollect any instance of the kind. I know it is used for the place of the dead, and means the invisible world, from the Greek *α* and *εἶδος*, I see not.



*Pneu.* How, then, can you make out that it is after the resurrection the scene is laid by the Saviour? Is it credible to suppose that he so far forgot himself as to confound *hades* with gehenna, the place into which both soul and body are to be cast at the resurrection? How natural the statement—"The rich man *died* and *was buried*, (not raised from the dead,) and in hell, or *hades*, he lifted up his eyes," &c. There not only is no resurrection named, or even hinted at, but the place of the dead is introduced as the place where he is in torment.

*Mate.* But the bodily members are named, as eyes, tongue, finger, &c., which it would be absurd to affirm of a disembodied spirit.

*Pneu.* How so? Has not a spirit all the members of the body? Did not our Saviour confirm this idea when his disciples supposed they had seen a spirit, and he said—"Handle me and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have?" This is the only distinction which appears to the senses. So that the fact of their having bodily members is no argument against the disembodied state. There is one fact of which you or any one else may satisfy himself,—and that is, that the removal of an arm, leg, or any other member, from the body, does not destroy sensation in that member. Question the first person you meet who has lost a limb, Do you ever have sensation in that lost limb? And so far as I have become acquainted with such cases, there is a uniform affirmative.

*Mate.* What do you propose to prove by this fact?—for I admit that it is such.

*Pneu.* I propose to illustrate the truth of our Saviour's remark, that those "who can kill the body, are not able to kill the soul." That the soul and spirit pervade the entire body and constitute the living and sentient agents in man, and that the removal of the fleshly covering does not destroy the existence of sensitiveness. Facts are stubborn things. And if one or all the limbs can be removed, and become decomposed, and something capable of sensation remain in their place, then it is conclusive evidence that the whole body may be removed and the inner man remain. And thus the apostle declares—"Though our

outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

*Mate.* This is an argument with which I have never before met, and I must confess I cannot answer it. For the fact is too common to admit of controversy. I will not deny a fact for any consideration, no matter how hard it may bear against my views. And as to the location of the scene, (Luke xvi.,) I must say, you have an argument on your side in the word *Hades*, which is invulnerable. It fixes the scene after death, and before the resurrection. But then it is only a parable, and was never designed to teach theology.

*Pneu.* If it is a parable, what does it compare?

*Mate.* There seem to have been several points intended to be impressed by the parable. 1. It seems designed to show the folly and danger of trusting in riches; for the Pharisees, who were covetous, derided him, which drew forth the parable. 2. To expose the deception common among the Jews, that they should be saved because they were the children of Abraham. 3. That this life only is the time to secure salvation—and the certainty of perishing without hope if this period is neglected. 4. The sufficiency of the means now employed to turn men to God—and hence, the folly of supposing that some other means would be more effectual. Men would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

*Pneu.* I admit all these points to be taught, but how are they taught and enforced? Is it by referring them to a judgment and resurrection of the dead? How does he illustrate the lesson?

*Mate.* I have been accustomed to refer it to the resurrection state, but you have completely taken from me that favourite argument; for the rich man is said to be in *hades*, and the five brethren of the rich man alive, and Lazarus dead, so that if he went he would rise from the dead. There is the lesson; but if it is a parable, I must say I do not know what it compares, nor do I see the basis on which the parable rests. For if my theory is correct, it is founded on an entire falsehood; to say which would be to charge the Saviour, not only foolishly, but blasphemously. It cannot be that he would construct a parable

on one of the grossest of errors, and throughout his whole life give no intimation that it was an error. For it is a historical fact, that the Pharisees to whom he addressed himself, believed the doctrine as he presented it. If they were in error, his parable served to confirm them in it, and he became a false teacher.

*Pneu.* I am glad to find you perceive the consequences of your position, and are disposed so candidly to admit them. But may I ask, Did you never reflect on the singular fact that neither our Saviour nor any of his apostles ever preached one recorded discourse to teach the doctrine of the unconsciousness of the dead? They certainly were not as vigilant, nor as valiant for the truth, if truth it is, as some of our modern teachers, who rarely preach a sermon without unmistakeably and unequivocally preaching the doctrine, besides writing and publishing volume after volume on the same theme.

*Mate.* There probably was not the same amount of error, arising from the popular theology, to call forth such efforts, as there is at present.

*Pneu.* This is marvellous. It is notorious that the Pharisees, who were the leading theologians of the age, constantly and strongly contended for the truth of an intermediate state of consciousness, as well as a resurrection. Why, then, did not the Saviour caution his hearers on the subject? Instead of this, both he and his disciples took sides with the Pharisees on this point.

*Mate.* Well, I must confess that I have never before reflected on that circumstance.

*Pneu.* Nor do I suppose one out of a hundred materialists ever permitted the thought to find a place in their minds. If they did, they certainly, if honest, would pause before they so pertinaciously urged their views on all occasions. They are not followers of either Christ or his apostles in this respect.

But, while on this point, permit me also to candidly ask, Do not the promises of Christ to the dying thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise,"—the history of the rich man and Lazarus,—the language of Paul, (2 Cor. iv. 16.) "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day,"—and ch. v. 6, 8,

that "whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord;" "We are confident and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord,"—Phil. i. 23, 24, "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you,"—together with the teaching of 1 Pet. iii. 19, that the Spirit of Christ, in the days of Noah, went and preached to the spirits now in prison,—and 1 Pet. iv. 6, that the dead live according to God in spirit, carry on the face of them, as the most natural meaning, the doctrine of consciousness after death? I do not ask whether they may not be so explained as to be made to mean something else, but what is the most obvious meaning of the texts?

*Mate.* I confess this to be the plain and obvious sense of the passages named. But you know we have an explanation of them which removes their force against our theory.

*Pneu.* Yes, I am aware of that; but I never witness an attempt to explain them away without thinking, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." On each point the explanation is forced and unnatural, and must be unsatisfactory even to those who attempt it.

*Mate.* True; but, then, you know we feel the importance of harmonizing those texts with such as these—"The dead know not any thing," and "In that very day their thoughts perish," &c.

*Pneu.* But we have found a consistent explanation of those texts in the context, and they cannot with any propriety be brought forward as opposed to the clearly expressed sentiments of the New Testament. You were compelled to acknowledge the justness of the exposition of Eccl. ix., and also of Ps. cxlvi. 4.

*Mate.* It appears to me that the doctrine of an intermediate state of conscious existence after death, and before the second Advent of Christ, has led to a denial of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; for the Bible tells us, Ps. xvi. 11, "In thy presence is fulness of joy." And if at death the spirit enters heaven, for what does he return again to the body? What more can he have than fulness of joy? To say that the happiness of the saints is not complete till the



resurrection, and yet to maintain that their spirits are with Christ, seems to me a palpable contradiction.

*Pneu.* I think a careful inquiry will prove the fact that of those who, within a few years, have gone into Shakerism and spiritualism, the great majority, probably four-fifths, were previously Materialists. The great body of evangelical Christians, who, from the days of Christ, have held the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, believed also in the doctrine of consciousness in death. So far as I am acquainted, there are more Materialists who become disciples of the rapping spirits, than of the other class—the Sadducees of the days of Christ denied a spiritual existence, and the resurrection. Materialism is no safeguard against a denial of the resurrection of the body, or spiritualism in any form. As to the perfection of bliss before the resurrection, it is not the question. Do the Scriptures teach that the believer, when absent from the body, is present with the Lord? If so, we are bound to believe it on their authority, not because we can understand all the philosophy of the fact. Does the Bible teach the doctrine of the resurrection? If so, if we know the Scriptures and the power of God, we shall believe. There may be fulness of joy in a place, and yet an individual in that place be perfectly miserable,—or every degree of enjoyment may be there from perfect misery to perfect bliss, according to the qualifications of different individuals to enjoy it. Adam, Eve, Cain, &c., were in God's presence after they sinned, but were far from happy there. The argument is most puerile and sophistical. Satan was in heaven in the days of Job, but not happy there. There must be a resurrection of the body, in order to the fulfilment of God's promises to man, that "the meek shall inherit the earth." A disembodied spirit cannot do this. God made the earth for man, and man for it; and hence, in order to fulfil his design, there must be a resurrection. Is not that conclusive?

*Mate.* I admit it is. The happiness of a spirit in heaven is not what God has promised his saints. The new earth in a glorified body will fulfil his purpose and promise to man.

*Pneu.* There is another argument in support of the

doctrine of a conscious existence after death which is perfectly invulnerable,—I refer to the spiritual manifestations of these last days. That there is a reality in these developments, is undeniable. The most confirmed skeptics or Deists, and Materialists of all classes, who have been confirmed in their unbelief of a spiritual existence, have been compelled to confess the reality of the facts. And all attempts to disprove or explain the phenomena on any other principle than the obvious one, has been a signal failure. For instance, the theory of Professor Loomis, that the sounds were produced by the dropping of water near Rochester, was most childish. Just as though it could communicate intelligently with those who held only a mental communication, remove chairs, tables, and other articles, from place to place, at the request of individuals! Nor is the more recent explanation any more reasonable, that the sounds are produced by the snapping of the joints of the spiritual medium. That they are really spiritual agents who communicate with the living, I think none can doubt who will make inquiry, if they will believe the testimony of the most reliable witnesses of the age.

*Mate.* I acknowledge the manifestations to be by spirits, but not human spirits. They are evidently what Paul foretold, 1 Tim. iv. 1—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." It is manifest that these are the *demons* whose teachings turn some from the faith. But observe—while they call themselves the spirits of John, Paul, Peter, Luther, Fox, Wesley, Washington, Franklin, &c. &c., Paul says they are *demons*.

*Pneu.* We are perfectly agreed as to their prophatic character, as you will find by reading the former numbers of the Pneumatologist, and also that they are demons. But the question is, What or who are these demons?

*Mate.* They, of course, are the fallen angels,—or the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation.

*Pneu.* Will you have the kindness to present me the evidence of that fact? Do not both Peter and Jude refute that idea? Peter informs us, 2 Pet. ii., God spared

not "the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, (Greek, *Tartarus*,) and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." Jude says of them—"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Both witnesses agree that those angels are confined, awaiting the judgment.

*Mate.* So also they speak of the spirits of the antediluvians being in prison, and of the rich man in *hades*.

*Pneu.* I grant it. But because a specified class of human spirits are in prison, it does not follow that all are. Do the Scriptures recognise the fact of communion between the living and dead? This is the true point at issue. For if they do, they are sufficiently at liberty to accomplish their work. Had no such thing as Necromancy existed or been possible in the nature of things, God would never have enacted a law prohibiting it. He might have prohibited the deceptive pretence to Necromancy; but he would not have prohibited the thing itself as he has done, Deut. xviii., alleging that the Canaanites practised those abominations. The name, Necromancer, describes his work as "one who reveals future events by communication with the dead." For this is its true definition.

*Mate.* But do not many learned men, lexicographers, and others, call it all deception?

*Pneu.* They do; and so they ridicule the idea of the spiritual rappings and other notorious facts, and call it all deception and humbuggery. But the facts exist, and exactly correspond with the definition of Necromancy. If men did, in the days of Moses, as God declares, practise Necromancy, what reason have we when we meet with the same professed practice, to doubt the reality? I am aware that I have subjected myself to ridicule and sarcasm for openly professing to believe the reality of these things. But I have the happiness of knowing that my greatest contemners have been forced to admit the same to be realities.

*Mate.* True, the word Necromancer does signify one who has communications with the dead. And it is equally

so that the spiritualists of our day profess the same art. And I think the law of God, Deut. xviii., is fully illustrated by these modern developments. But the apostle Paul calls the seducing spirits of the last times demons.

*Pneu.* I have already confessed my faith that they are demons; but I deny that there is any evidence of their being fallen angels, or a race of beings different from the human race. As you are aware, the Greek word demon, or daimoon, signifies *a knowing one*. That it was formerly applied to philosophers as a title of honour, on account of their great knowledge. But its true and fixed meaning among the ancients, from the earliest times, according to Hesiod, a Greek poet who wrote nearly a hundred years before Homer, is thus expressed:—“*The spirits of mortals become demons when separated from their earthly bodies.*” Plutarch, who relates the opinion of Hesiod, gives us also his own conviction, that “*the demons of the Greeks were the ghosts of departed men.*” Says Alexander Campbell—“Whoever will be at the pains to examine the pagan mythologists, one and all, will discover that some doctrine of demons, as respects their nature, abodes, characters, or employments, is the ultimate foundation of the whole superstructure; and that the radical idea of all the dogmata of their priests, and the fancies and fables of their poets, are found in that most ancient and veritable tradition—that *the spirits of men* survive their fallen tabernacles and live in their disembodied state from death to the dissolution of material nature.”

*Mate.* But are Christians to derive their sentiments from the heathen poets and mythologists? Why not appeal to the Scriptures? For all you have said is only pagan mythology.

*Pneu.* I grant it is pagan mythology. But if the word demon originated with pagans, and had, when applied to spirits, a determinate meaning, and the writers of the Bible have used the term as expressive of spiritual beings, without ever defining it, how shall we determine its import?

*Mate.* The only alternative in such a case would be to appeal to the prevailing use of the term among the people speaking that language.



*Pneu.* This is a plain, common sense view of the subject, and the only one we can take. The term, in one form or other, occurs in the New Testament seventy-five times; but none of the writers have defined its import. We can, therefore, only fall back on the original use of the term as used by pagans, Jews, and the early Christians. And they all used it to designate a disembodied human spirit.

The Bible teaches a multiplicity of demons, but no plurality of *devils* or Satans. Diabolos and Satanus are always in the singular number. But he has a variety of names, and a multitude of angels. *Demon* is found in both the singular and plural number, indicating sometimes one, and sometimes many. The only conclusion to which we can come is, that *the demons of the Bible are the spirits of the deceased.* See article *Demonology*, pp. 77—92.

*Mate.* But how did the Jews and early Christian fathers understand the term? For their opinion will have weight in fixing the popular meaning of the term in that age.

*Pneu.* Josephus, the Jewish historian, says—"Demons are the spirits of wicked men, who enter into living men and destroy them, unless they are so happy as to meet with speedy relief." Philo says—"The souls of dead men are called demons." Justin Martyr, one of the early Christian fathers, says—"Those who are seized and tormented by the souls of the dead, whom we call demons and madmen."

These testimonies are explicit, and confirm the conclusion already gained. Therefore, till you can produce evidence that some other and private meaning was attached to the term by our Lord and his apostles when you assume that the rapping spirits are demons, you acknowledge them also to be human spirits.

*Mate.* But may not the demons of Scripture signify malignant diseases and insanity?

*Pneu.* Not if your admission that the knocking spirits of our age are the demons predicted by Paul, is correct. Retract that admission, or acknowledge their personality.

And if you retract that, you are still bound to explain the phenomena.

*Mate.* I see you have me fast on this point. I cannot deny that you have presented a strong, fair, and conclusive argument in proof of the humanity of the New Testament demons. But yet I cannot believe that death means life, nor that a dead man is not dead. Death is presented to us by so many different expressions, all indicative of a cessation of being, that I cannot believe the popular doctrine. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise *perish*." "*Consume* them in wrath, *consume* them that they may not be." It is also called *destruction*, all of which terms convey the idea of utter extinction.

*Pneu.* I grant they are strong terms; but you must concede the point, that each of them is used in a sense different from that you seem to attach to it. They do not, either of them, always signify a cessation of being. The term *perish* we have already discussed; the term *destruction*, we shall have occasion to discuss hereafter, and will, for the present, pass it by. The term *consume* is the only one which, at present, claims our attention. And in the text quoted, I confess it is a strong expression: "Consume them, that they may not be." This, if any language can, would seem to indicate an entire extinction of being. But yet it does not. No synonyme of the word death can express more than that word itself. We have by a long and patient discussion established the fact, that man has a spirit which survives his body. However strong the expressions which convey the idea of death, they must be limited by that established fact. But in the case before us, the text limits and restricts itself. "Consume them, that they may not be; and let them know that God ruleth in Jacob; and at evening let them return; and make a noise like a dog, and go round about the city. Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied." The consumption here sought is not such as to prevent their knowing that God ruleth in Jacob. Nor yet such but what they are to return in the evening, &c. It is not, therefore, expressive of a cessation of conscious being. If they had no being, could they know that God ruleth? If they had no being, could they return, &c.?

*Mate.* The expressions are more guarded than I anticipated. I shall not urge the text as an argument. And I do not know but we have erred in insisting that these words must necessarily have this sense in preference to any other of which they are susceptible. There are some other things I might urge against your views, and in support of those I have entertained; but I am convinced that on this point I have been in error, and now am willing to admit that the scriptures, as well as facts, do prove that man possesses a spirit which survives death.

But, after all, the great point is the final doom of the wicked. I cannot believe that a God of love will keep the wicked for ever, or eternally, in conscious torment.

---

## PART SECOND.

### THE FINAL DOOM OF THE WICKED.

My respected opponent, Materialist, having renounced his faith in the doctrines of Materialism, and become a Pneumatologist, we can no longer with propriety conduct our discussion under that appellation: we shall therefore adopt the name of **DESTRUCTIONIST** as more expressive of his present views; for as he expressed himself, at the close of the discussion, he does not yet admit the doctrine of eternal conscious being in misery.

*Pneumatologist.* I am pleased once more to meet you, friend Destructionist; for I feel anxious to pursue the discussion of our theme, on which we have been dwelling, particularly that part which relates to the final destiny of the enemies of God.

*Destructionist.* I am the more anxious to resume our discussion, because I am confident you will find it more difficult to sustain your position than you did in our former discussion. You will hardly be able to escape the force of those scriptures which so plainly declare, "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life." "The soul that sinneth shall die." You here see that death and eternal life are opposed to each other; not eternal life and eternal conscious misery. A doctrine so palpably taught

should be most implicitly received. It is of comparatively small importance what the state of man is between death and the resurrection, but the dreadful thought, of an *eternity* of misery, is too much to endure.

*Pneu.* I confess it is a terrible thought, and if my sympathies were the arbiter of man's destiny, such an idea would be blotted from existence. But such is not the fact; God's threatenings will all be executed as well as his promises fulfilled. Our sympathies would remove the misery which surrounds us here, but we cannot do it; the violation of the laws of our being is certain to bring a train of evils to which the transgressor is forced to submit. It is the penalty of his transgression. Whatever God, in his word, has declared to be the portion of the wicked, will most assuredly be meted out to them.

With respect to the penalty of God's law, I grant he has announced death. But is that all he has threatened against sinners? You will hardly affirm that.

And as for the import of the word death, it is no longer an argument on your side of the question. For I have already proved, and you have acknowledged, that it does not imply a cessation of the conscious existence of the spirit. In order for the term death to avail you any thing, you should have established your position in the first part of our discussion, that death implies and is an extinction of conscious being. And failing to do that, you lose entirely the benefit of the term in this part of our discussion, unless you can prove that the second death embraces more than the first. The whole controversy turns on that point.

*Dest.* I perceive the force of your remark, and think I can prove that the second death does mean more than the first. The prophet Malachi, iv. 1, referring to the day of judgment, declares, that "The day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." This language can mean nothing less than an utter extinction.

*Pneu.* What do you understand the phraseology, "root and branch," to mean?

*Dest.* The entire being, to be sure. What else can it mean?



*Pneu.* How is the phraseology used in scripture? "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch." Jer. xxii. 5. "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots." Isa. xi. 1. "I am the root and offspring of David." Rev. xxii. 16. The father is called the root, and the son the branch. And this is the only *usus loquendi* of the phraseology, as used in the scriptures. The threat, therefore, is that the entire race, parent and child, shall be consumed in that day. If you have another, and more, or even as clear a scriptural illustration, I shall be happy to hear it.

*Dest.* I do not know as I have any other illustration: but it is a light in which I have never before looked at the passage. I must examine that view before I finally make up my judgment.

*Pneu.* But there is another point for you to establish, before you can derive any help from that text. You must prove that it points to the second death. That it does not, I am able to prove. 1. According to Rev. xix., at the coming of Christ, and the battle of that great day of God Almighty, and preceding the millennium, the beast and false prophet are to be taken and "cast alive into the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." 2. According to Rev. xx., the beast and false prophet will still be in the lake of fire at the end of the thousand years, when the devil is cast in there, and are still to be tormented, day and night, with the devil, for ever and ever. The lake of fire, therefore, exists both at the beginning and close of the millenium. All whose names are not written in the book of life are to be cast into that lake of fire, and "have their part in the lake of fire: this is the second death." 3. The burning foretold in the text, is at the coming of Christ to make up his jewels, when they shall return and discern between the righteous and the wicked: and the distinction is to be made by the wicked being burnt, and the Sun of righteousness arising on those who fear God's name. It is thus fixed at the coming of Christ and the millenium. For they that are Christ's at his coming, are then to be raised and glorified in the twinkling of an eye. But 4. The second death is not inflicted till the end of the thousand years, and after the resurrection of the wicked.

Malachi, therefore, does not predict the second death, but the first; in which I have proved to you the spirit exists in consciousness.

*Dest.* I have always supposed the lake of fire meant the conflagration of the earth; and that it will be after the millennium in which all the enemies of God will be destroyed.

*Pneu.* If you take the position that the lake of fire is the earth in a state of conflagration, you are forced to admit that it takes place before the millennium. For it is into the lake of fire the beast and false prophet are to be cast before the millennium; the same lake into which the devil and wicked men are to be cast after the millennium. But the wicked are to be raised after the thousand years, and then be cast there. The burning of the earth, therefore, does not constitute the lake of fire, nor the second death. But Malachi does describe the burning of the earth, and the fact of its restitution, by assuring the saints that they shall "tread down the wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I do this, saith the Lord of hosts." It is not, therefore, the *second death*.

*Dest.* But if you drive me from Malachi, yet the language of the Saviour is plain: "And shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Will you deny that this expresses an entire consumption?

*Pneu.* Really, my friend, if truth and faithfulness to my trust would permit me, I would give you the benefit of this one text; but they will not allow it. For, 1st. The verb *kata kausei*, "shall burn," does not express the particle *up*. Nor do our translators insert *up* in Matth. xiii. 30, 40, in each of which texts the word occurs. It is an affix, by the translators, to give intensity to the expression. Again, the expression, *puri asbesto*, rendered *unquenchable fire*, is more strong than the translation. *Asbestos*, instead of being unquenchable is "*unconsumable*." The most intense fire will not consume it. The expression, therefore, would be more properly rendered, "He shall burn the chaff with unconsumable fire." Such is the fire of Gehenna, in which the wicked will have their portion, according to the testimony of Christ, Mark ix. 43, "Than having two

hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched;" (*eis ten Gehenna, eis to pur to asbeston*—into Gehenna, into the fire *asbestos*, which would be fire *unconsumable*;) "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." And to give force to this idea, the Saviour added, "For every one shall be salted with fire, even as every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." The object of salt on flesh is to preserve it from putrefaction; and this same office, fire shall fill, in the case of sinners in Gehenna. The idea is terrible.

*Dest.* The language is certainly very strong; and the word *asbestos* seems to favour your construction, for I admit that it is a substance unconsumable by fire. And the comparison of the fire and salt as preservatives from decomposition, is a point I have not heretofore considered. Yet this does not relieve your position of the difficulty presented by the apostle, 2 Thess. i. 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power."

*Pneu.* On what words do you rely, to prove the doctrine of an extinction of conscious being by this text?

*Dest.* On the words "everlasting destruction," and "from the presence of God and the glory of his power." For what is destroyed has no being, especially out of God's presence. For the presence of God is universal.

*Pneu.* Do you recollect the definition Donnegan gives of the Greek word *olethros*, here rendered *destruction*?

*Dest.* Yes; he defines it, *Ruin; Perdition*: and metaphorically, applied to persons, *a scourge or plague*.

*Pneu.* So you think everlasting ruin, or an everlasting scourge or plague, must of necessity be an everlasting extinction of conscious being! Would not the passage read altogether differently, were it thus translated—"Who shall be punished with an everlasting plague from the presence of God and the glory of his power?" And would it not be a correct and literal rendering?

*Dest.* I admit that according to Donnegan's definition, it is a correct and justified translation, and does not establish my view; but their punishment "FROM the presence of God," must establish the doctrine.

*Pneu.* Yes, if the fact that "Cain went out from the

presence of the Lord," proves that he ceased to live in consciousness, Gen. iv. 16; or that "Satan went out from the presence of the Lord," Job i. 12, proves that he was extinguished; but not otherwise. God is to dwell in the holy city, "and his servants shall serve him, and they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads; and they shall reign for ever and ever." But "without" the city, "are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers," &c. This is evidently what is meant by their being punished with everlasting ruin, perdition, scourge, or plague, from the presence of God, and from the glory of his power. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." "And holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."

*Dest.* I can find no fault with this view of the subject, for it is scriptural and fair.

But, still, the antithesis, *eternal life*, and *destruction*, stand in the word of God. "Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way which leadeth unto destruction, and many there be which go in thereat. Because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Life and destruction are here the opposite of each other.

*Pneu.* Will you have the kindness to tell me the original word, here rendered destruction?

*Dest.* It is Apooleian, and is defined by Donnegan, "*loss, perdition, death.*"

*Pneu.* Then he does not give the definition at all, which our translators have selected.

*Dest.* No, that is not among his definitions. But perdition is, and it amounts to the same thing.

*Pneu.* Let us examine some of the passages where the word perdition occurs. 2 Pet. iii. 7, "Day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." The word here rendered perdition is the same as Matth. vii. 13, *apooleia*. Rev. xvii. 11, "And the beast which thou sawest was, and is not and goeth into *perdition.*" This also is *apooleia*. What is the final perdition of ungodly men?

*Dest.* The last account we have of them in the Bible is found in Rev. xxi. 8. "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers;



and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." And Rev. xxii. 14, 15. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." This being the last account we have of them, I conclude that they are utterly consumed in the lake of fire, which is the second death.

*Pneu.* And yet afterward we are told that while the saints enter into the city, the wicked are without! In a state of nonentity, of course!! But what is the *perdition* which, according to scripture, awaits the beast?

*Dest.* We read, Rev. xx., that he and the false prophet are both "taken and cast alive into the lake of fire and brimstone," and I suppose burnt up.

*Pneu.* But what reason have you for supposing he is burnt up; have we no farther scriptural account of him?

*Dest.* There is one more reference to him. Rev. xx. 10, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

*Pneu.* Then it seems they survive for a thousand years at least, in destruction, or perdition, or death, according as we render the word.

*Dest.* That does not follow; the word *are* is not in the original, and we have as good a right to insert "*were*," as the translators have "*are*."

*Pneu.* That must depend on the grammatical construction of the original. Can you inform me of what number and person the word rendered "shall be tormented" is?

*Dest.* It is in the third person plural.

*Pneu.* What pronoun will it require to agree with it?

*Dest.* Of course, the third person plural, *they*.

*Pneu.* What is the antecedent of the pronoun *they*? It cannot be the devil, for that is in the singular.

*Dest.* It must refer to the three beings before named: the beast, the false prophet, and the devil.

*Pneu.* Then a proper translation would be, "Where the beast and false prophet *are*," not *were*.

*Dest.* Yes, I must admit the construction of the original requires *are* to be inserted or understood, and that the beast and false prophet are to share the devil's doom in the lake of fire—and that will constitute his final perdition.

*Pneu.* But what do the scriptures teach will be the devil's doom?

*Dest.* Paul says Christ will destroy him. Heb. ii. 14, "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." I therefore conclude he will be destroyed.

*Pneu.* So do I conclude he will be destroyed, as well as ungodly men and the beast. But how does the word of God declare he is to be destroyed, or in what is his destruction to consist? I do not ask for your or any other man's opinion, but for a "Thus saith the Lord."

*Dest.* Well, if you will drive me to extremities, I must refer you to Rev. xx. 10, "And they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." But you very well know that the words "for ever," and "for ever and ever," sometimes are used to express limited duration.

*Pneu.* Supposing it is so; have we not clearly reached the eternal state, at the point where the devil is to be cast into the lake of fire?

*Dest.* We have not got beyond day and night; hence there must be successive duration: and the planetary system must be in existence. But of the eternal state, it is said, "There shall be no night there."

*Pneu.* But what department of the eternal state is it of which this is affirmed?

*Dest.* It is recorded, Rev. xxi. 25, "And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day, for there shall be no night there."

*Pneu.* It is only in the holy city, then, that there shall be no night. And the reason is assigned: "the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." But is not the perpetuity of the throne of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, to be graduated by the perpetuity of day and night? "Thus saith the Lord, If ye can break my

covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season, then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers." Jer. xxxiii. 20, 21. As long, therefore, as Christ reigns on David's throne, day and night must continue, and the beast, devil, and false prophet be tormented.

The argument may be thus summed up:—

1. The Greek word *απωλεια*, *apooleia*, rendered sometimes *destruction*, sometimes *perdition*, is used to express the final doom of both the apocalyptic beast and wicked men.

2. Of the beast, the scriptures declare that he shall be tormented in the lake of fire and brimstone, day and night, for ever and ever.

3. The same lake of fire is the doom of all wicked men. "And all whose names were not written in the book of life were cast into the lake of fire." Again of the wicked it is said, "And he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." The destruction or perdition of the enemies of God, therefore, consists in everlasting torment, day and night, in the lake of fire and brimstone.

*Dest.* But the torment with fire and brimstone, spoken of in chap. xiv., is not the future and final punishment of the wicked, but the torment which the worshippers of the beast are to receive under the last seven plagues. "And men were scorched with great heat."

*Pneu.* Can you point out any indications that fire and brimstone are the agents used in those plagues; and that day and night, for ever and ever, their smoke is to go up, and they find no rest?

*Dest.* No, I do not find any such intimation. But the fact of fire being the agent of torment is predicted.

*Pneu.* Do you find any threat that fire and brimstone will be an agent in the second death?

*Dest.* Yes—"The fearful," &c., "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."

*Pneu.* For which view is there the strongest scriptural ground?

*Dest.* I acknowledge the letter of Scripture favours you most strongly.

*Pneu.* Does not the general expression of the Bible, as well as these particular portions, indicate the same thing? "And shall cast them into a furnace of fire, there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." "Where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not-quenched." Do not these expressions indicate torment?

*Dest.* They do; and I admit that the wicked will experience torment in enduring the second death, more or less protracted, according to their character, but not eternal. It is the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment to which I object.

*Pneu.* But you denied, just now, that Rev. xiv. referred to a future state, because it predicted the torment of the wicked, when Rev. xxi. 8 does not speak of their being tormented.

*Dest.* Well, I must admit that they will be tormented with fire and brimstone, or by whatever it symbolizes, but not eternally.

*Pneu.* But not only Rev. xiv. and xx. both speak of the torment being everlasting, but Matt. xxv. 41, 46—"Depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting fire* prepared for the devil and his angels." We have already seen that the lake of fire and brimstone is the place where the devil and his angels, the beast and false prophet, are to be for ever and ever tormented. The wicked share their fate.

Again—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Hence, as long as the eternal life of the righteous continues, the punishment of the wicked is to endure.

*Dest.* I grant the punishment is to be as enduring as the life of the righteous. But punishment does not necessarily imply torment or suffering. Extinction of being would be punishment, and everlasting punishment, from which there will be no recovery.



*Pneu.* Do you recollect the definition Donnegan gives of *κολασις*, the Greek word here rendered punishment?

*Dest.* He defines it, "The act of clipping or pruning; generally, restriction, restraint, reproof, check, chastisement; *lit.* and *met.*, punishment."

*Pneu.* Do you find any thing in this definition to warrant the idea of an extinction of being?

*Dest.* Yes, the idea of excision is embraced in that of clipping or pruning.

*Pneu.* For what purpose is the act of pruning performed?—as a punishment, or improvement?

*Dest.* Generally, I allow, as an improvement. And yet it is an act of excision of useless branches.

*Pneu.* But does not the idea of pruning refer more to the tree than to the branches which are cut off? Is it not more as a benefit than an infliction, the act is performed?

*Dest.* That, I must admit, is the true idea of pruning.

*Pneu.* Is there any other definition which will amit of the idea of extinction at all? Do not each of the others indicate sensible suffering?

*Dest.* They do; at least that is the most prominent idea conveyed by them. *Punishment*, as I said before, does not necessarily imply perpetuated suffering.

*Pneu.* Is not all punishment designed to produce suffering—1, in its own nature? and, 2, by producing a sense of shame? And is not this what the prophet declared—"some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt?" They meet the everlasting contempt of all holy beings, and are filled with shame. And as long as the contempt endures, so long the shame lasts. The prophet Isaiah expresses the same sentiment, (lxv. 23—24.) The parallel is here full. As long as the new heavens and earth remain, the name and seed of Israel remain. And from week to week, and month to month, all flesh will go up to the holy city to worship, and "go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." But they (the men who have transgressed) "shall be an abhorring to all flesh." The duration is graduated by that of the new earth.

*Dest.* This is certainly a strong text; but were it not

for the parallel instituted, the duration of the new earth, I should think it might be of the same class of texts as Jer. xvii. 27; that is, it shall not be quenched till it consumes the palaces of Jerusalem. But that parallel forbids such a classification. But I find myself thrown off the track; I have been accustomed to introduce 2 Thess. i. as an explanation of the kind of punishment to be inflicted; "everlasting destruction;" but you have foreclosed that argument, and greatly embarrass me. But are the wicked immortal?—for that, after all, is the great question.

*Pneū.* The answer to that question must depend on the meaning you attach to the term. There are two Greek words used in the New Testament, each of which is sometimes rendered *immortality*, and *immortal*—one uniformly and properly, the other occasionally and by implication.

*Αθανασία*, truly rendered *immortality*, signifies deathlessness; it is the exact opposite of mortality, subject to death. It, like *mortal*, is only used in reference to the human body, when in Scripture it is applied to man. The Scriptures never speak of a *mortal spirit*, but they do of a *mortal body*. The word is used three times in the New Testament, and always applied to a glorified and resurrected human body. It does not apply either to God the Father, or to the angels, in one instance. 1 Tim. vi. 16, applies the term to Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, "who only hath IMMORTALITY." The other two instances are 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. In both verses the word relates to the body. "This mortal must put on immortality." "And this mortal shall have put on immortality." This is part of the answer to the question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" The wicked are not immortal in this sense; that is, they have not, nor will they ever have glorified bodies, like Christ and his saints, which only constitutes scriptural immortality, properly so called.

*Αφθαρσία*, the other word rendered immortality, signifies *incorruptibility*, not subject to decomposition or corruption. It is, with its adjective, *Aphthartos*, applied to God the Father. Rom. i. 23, "The uncorruptible God." 1 Tim. i. 17, "King eternal, immortal, invisible."

Here the word rendered immortal, is *Aphthartos*, incorruptible. It is descriptive of material substance. 1 Pet. i. 4, "To an inheritance *incorruptible*." It applies to the resurrection body of the saints. 1 Cor. xv. 53, "This corruptible must put on incorruption." It describes moral purity. Eph. vi. 24, "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in *sincerity*; *Aphtharsai*, incorruptibility. It is also applied to the human spirit. 1 Pet. iii. 3, 4, "Whose adorning," . . . "the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit."

I will not, therefore, undertake to prove that the wicked, as such, are immortal in either sense, or that they ever will be. But that the *spirit*, the hidden man of the heart, is immortal in the sense of incorruptible, the Word of God authorizes us to say.

*Dest.* Does not *eis too Aphtharto*, "on the immortal," refer rather to the graces, meekness and quietness, than the spirit they are to adorn?

*Pneu.* Clearly not. The spirit is the hidden man, or as Paul expresses it, the inward man, which is to be adorned with meekness and quietness. The forbidden ornaments belong to the body, which is corruptible. The approved adorning is of the inward man, "on the immortal." What is that *immortal*? The spirit. With what is it to be adorned? With meekness and quietness. Such an adorning is in the sight of God of great price. I have, therefore, proved—1st, that the spirit does not die with the body; 2d, that Peter calls it *immortal*, in the sense of *Aphthartos*, incorruptible; 3d, the spirit of man is never called mortal, and death is never affirmed of it. The phraseology, immortal spirit, is justified by the Word of God.

You have failed to prove that the second death means more than the first; and, therefore, the most you can gain from the word death, is its import as already established. It does not, and cannot prove an extinction of conscious being.

*Dest.* I have never before had my attention called to the passage in Peter, declaring the spirit to be incorruptible or immortal.

On the second death I have not yet concluded my evidence. Rev. xx. 8, 9, we are told of the last assault of Gog and Magog on the beloved city; "and that fire came down from God out of heaven and *devoured* them." If they are devoured, must not that be the end of them?

*Pneu.* Not unless Christ ceased to exist when he drove out the profaners of the temple. John. ii. 17, "And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath *eaten me up*;" *kataphage*, engorged or swallowed me. This is the same word used, Rev. xx. 9, for *devoured*. So, also, Matt. xiii. 4, "And the fowls came and devoured them up," or swallowed them. The text, therefore, only teaches that the fire will engorge or swallow them; or they will be cast into the lake of fire. It does not teach the extinction of their being.

*Dest.* The lake of fire which devours Gog and Magog must differ, for the fire in one case comes down from heaven, and devours or burns them up; and in the other it is represented as existing, and the wicked to be cast into it.

*Pneu.* Very well; in that case you have not proved it to be the second death; for they must, even after that, be cast into the lake of fire, where all whose names are not written in the book of life are to be cast. Thus your argument again fails you.

*Dest.* But the doctrine of eternal hell torments is calculated to make Infidels and Universalists, while the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked disarms them of their great weapon so successfully wielded against the Bible and the doctrine of future punishment. Both Infidels and Universalists acknowledge the reasonableness of the destruction doctrine as being consistent with the idea of the Divine benevolence.

*Pneu.* Your remark reminds me of Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, who found a way by which he might have escaped persecution; and that was by preaching circumcision. Then, he said, "would the offence of the cross cease." Likewise our Lord would not have lost so many disciples, had he not insisted that his flesh was meat indeed, and his blood was drink indeed! A few years since, a Sabbatarian said to me—"With this doc-



trine we can approach the Jew, and he will listen to us." I replied—So he would be still more reconciled if you will deny Jesus Christ. But it is no part of Christianity to accommodate its teachings to the vitiated views and wishes of the enemies of God. But whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, we are to speak God's word to them, and leave them to settle the account with him if they rebel against it. There is not one threat too many in the Bible, to accomplish the object for which it was given, the awakening of sinners by an appeal to their fears. For say what you will about drawing and winning them by love and the melting strains of mercy, it still remains a stern fact that the Bible is full of threatenings of the most awful character; and unless they are meaningless, they were put there for the purpose of alarming men's fears, deterring them from sin, and leading them to repentance. And if such is the fact, I have never yet been able to discern the propriety of explaining away the apparent import of even the most awful threatenings. How terrible the responsibility! How shall we meet it at the judgment? If sinners will die, let them take the responsibility on themselves of undervaluing God's word, and setting it at naught.

*Dest.* I confess you have entirely disarmed me of all my strong arguments in favour of both the sleep of the dead and the end of the wicked. I see the subject in a light entirely different from what I did when our discussion began. I then really supposed your views to be entirely baseless, and that every part of the word of God favoured my theory, and that it was only wilful blindness and rejection of the truth which induced any one to adhere to your opinions.

But I now confess that the Bible does teach the distinct formation of the human spirit; that it is neither made of dust, nor returns to dust at death, but remains in a state of conscious existence, awaiting the judgment; and I perceive with equal clearness, that the texts which I supposed unequivocally taught the doctrine of the extinction of the wicked, have entirely failed me; and that a careful analysis of them shows that they warrant no such idea.

I must also abandon my peculiarly cherished notion

of the great advantage the doctrine gave me with Infidels and Universalists. For it is true, that they are only reconciled to it in proportion as it accords with and favours their own doctrine.

I must, therefore, abandon it, as both an unsound and dangerous doctrine, and henceforth labour according to my ability to repair the evil I have done by my teachings in leading others astray. My brethren, with whom I have formerly been associated in faith, will, of course, blame me for so soon abandoning their positions, and yielding to your arguments. To this I have only to say, if any of them fancy they could have done better in the discussion, let them try it. And if equally candid, and determined to follow wherever the truth leads, I have but little doubt for the result.

---

### DANGERS OF SPIRITUALISM.

The spiritual developments of this age are illustrated in the former part of the volume; and the dangers to be apprehended from that source, pointed out. But we cannot close the work without reverting once more to the subject. The spread of the abomination has been, as we anticipated, exceedingly rapid; and it becomes the ministry and membership to awake to the subject, and inform themselves on the matter, that they may be able to give the trump a certain sound. As long as the present apathy prevails among ministers, and it is treated as a humbug, the people under their charge, who examine for themselves the facts in the case, will be taken in the snare.

The manifestations are becoming continually more numerous and open, and are made with greater facility than formerly. It is stated by those best informed on the subject, that there are over one hundred thousand persons now in the country, firm adherents to the spiritual system. New circles are weekly formed in this city for the purpose of receiving spiritual communications. The intercourse with the spiritual beings who meet them, is as free and real as though they were present visibly, and conversed face to face; and communications are made on all conceivable subjects.



## EVILS OF SUCH INTERCOURSE.

But it will be asked, what harm can there be in such communications with spirits? We reply,

1. It is a palpable violation of God's law, Deut. xviii. And he declares that all who do such things are "an abomination to the Lord." This is sufficient. But,

2. It is dangerous. The spirits do inflict bodily injury on individuals. Some have been most cruelly handled, so as to be worn out, and prostrated by sickness, till they had no peace of their lives. Household goods have been broken, missiles thrown, articles carried away and lost, &c.

3. It is a species of demoniacal possession. Those who have been mesmeric subjects are the best and easiest mediums for the spirits. They, more than others, yield to the will of the spirit. The spirits can do but little till they have such a medium through which to act.

4. Those who become mediums, become infatuated and spell-bound, and live, in a great measure, under an unnatural influence; their eyes heavy, and energies prostrated. Animal magnetism was evidently a harbinger of the spirits, sent to prepare their way, by preparing mediums for them.

5. It is dangerous even to visit a circle as a matter of curiosity. No matter how strong the unbelief and abhorrence against the system may be; and it is especially so, for those easily affected by mesmerism. Some who have gone, and refused, even when there, to commune with the spirits, and even have firmly and openly denounced them as wicked and wrong, have been bewitched, and tormented day and night till they would submit to the influence. *Let all beware!*

6. Their doctrines are most dangerous and pernicious. They generally deny the atonement, the resurrection, and the doctrine of future punishment of the wicked. They destroy entirely the solemnity and awe which attaches to the spiritual world, and render it a matter of little moment how soon we enter there, no matter what the character; for all, they teach, are better off there than here.

It is the duty of every Christian church to set itself

firmly against their members having any connexion with the subject, it being one of the unfruitful works of darkness which are to be reprov'd. That it will continue to spread, and become the means of great evil, we can have no doubt. It is like the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish. The feats of Salem witchcraft will no doubt be re-enacted, and fill the world.

---

### NOTICE.

These Nos. close the volume of 288 pages, and with it we close the work. The work will be bound, both in paper for mailing; and in muslin, lettered, for those who wish it. Price, in paper covers, 75 cents—four copies for \$2.00. Bound in muslin, \$1.00. Address J. LITCH, Philadelphia.

---

### INDEX.

|                            | Page |                                | Page |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|
| Introduction,              | 1    | Divination—Mesmerism,          | 117  |
| Prevision,                 | 3    | Inspiration of False Prophets, | 137  |
| Nature of Spirits,         | 6    | Dixborough Ghost,              | 139  |
| Spiritual Manifestations,  | 13   | Progress of Romanism,          | 145  |
| The Knockings,             | 15   | Prayer for England,            | 150  |
| Remarks—Familiar Spirits,  | 22   | Irish Servant Girls,           | 151  |
| Physical Power of Spirits, | 24   | Cardinal Wiseman,              | 155  |
| Theological Views,         | 25   | Canon Law,                     | 159  |
| Intelligence of Spirits,   | 26   | Wiseman to Dr. Cumming,        | 162  |
| A Trance,                  | 30   | Wiseman's Reply to Russel,     | 164  |
| Appearance of a Spirit,    | 32   | Prussia,                       | 178  |
| Veracity of the Spirits,   | 34   | Popery in the United States,   | 181  |
| Necromancy,                | 39   | Monster Emigration,            | 184  |
| Illustration of Trance,    | 41   | Destiny of Rome,               | 186  |
| Animal Magnetism,          | 43   | Man of Sin,                    | 197  |
| Voluntary Trance,          | 44   | Issue with Popery,             | 200  |
| Nature of the Soul,        | 45   | Review of Dobney on the        |      |
| Forewarning of Death,      | 54   | Doom of the Wicked,            | 204  |
| Wesley—E. Hobson,          | 55   | Dialogue between Pneumato-     |      |
| Sermon on Heb. xii. 18—22, | 66   | logist and Materialist, on     |      |
| Demonology—A. Campbell,    | 77   | "Sleep of the Dead."           | 240  |
| State of the Dead—Facts,   | 92   | Do. on Final Doom of the       |      |
| Apparition—Praying Nanny,  | 99   | Wicked,                        | 271  |
| Hades,                     | 102  | Dangers of Spiritualism,       | 286  |
| Demoniacal Miracles,       | 110  |                                |      |